

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 22, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Monday, February 19, 1940

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Linus C. Glotzbach, to be regional director, Work Projects Administration, for region VII.

S. L. Stolte, to be Work Projects Administrator for Minnesota.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Philip B. Fleming, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Joseph T. Sylvester, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Thomas Holcomb to be major general.
Holland M. Smith to be brigadier general.
Philip H. Torrey to be brigadier general.
Ross E. Rowell to be brigadier general.
John Marston to be brigadier general.
Samuel M. Harrington to be brigadier general.
Fred S. Robillard to be lieutenant colonel.
Blythe G. Jones to be lieutenant colonel.
Robert C. Kilmartin, Jr., to be lieutenant colonel.
Edward A. Craig to be lieutenant colonel.
Bernard Dubel to be lieutenant colonel.
Leland S. Swindler to be lieutenant colonel.
Ford O. Rogers to be lieutenant colonel.
Walter G. Farrell to be lieutenant colonel.
Ralph R. Robinson to be lieutenant colonel.
Frederick E. Stack to be lieutenant colonel.
John D. Muncie to be major.
William E. Burke to be major.
Robert G. Hunt to be major.
James E. Kerr to be major.
William G. Manley to be major.
Albert D. Cooley to be major.
Theodore A. Holdahl to be major.
William K. Enright to be captain.
Marion A. Fawcett to be captain.
Robert O. Bisson to be captain.
James G. Smith to be captain.
James F. Climie to be captain.
David S. McDougal to be captain.
William A. Kengla to be captain.
Ralph L. Houser to be first lieutenant.
Charles S. Todd to be first lieutenant.
Charles J. Seibert, 2d, to be first lieutenant.
James W. Keene to be second lieutenant.
William C. Kellum to be second lieutenant.
John F. Kinney to be second lieutenant.
Roger C. Power, Jr., to be second lieutenant.
Richard K. Schmidt to be second lieutenant.
Walter M. Henderson to be chief marine gunner.
Carl M. McPherson to be chief quartermaster clerk.
Clyde T. Smith to be chief quartermaster clerk.
George R. Frank to be chief pay clerk.
John H. Rath to be chief pay clerk.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Fred G. Sutherland, Pasadena.
Ray O. Caukin, Sierra Madre.

MINNESOTA

Roman A. Schmid, Avon.
Harry M. Koop, Crosby.

James E. Cashman, Owatonna.
Mary E. Herron, Watertown.

NEW YORK

Fred T. Frisby, Franklin Square.
Ida J. Posten, Greenwood Lake.
H. Greeley Howland, Hamden.
William G. Mollitor, Hicksville.
James A. Wigg, Hyde Park.
Clifton R. Ericsson, Kennedy.
Frank J. Ball, Lancaster.
Wesley Terry Howland, Leonardville.
Edward J. Murtaugh, Lockport.
Sylvia F. Kenney, Long Eddy.
Paul F. Plante, Mooers.
Lee H. Starr, Morris.
Francis T. Callan, Mumford.
William H. Miller, Narrowsburg.
Robert F. Talbot, New Berlin.
Minnie Losty Smith, New Lebanon.
Jay Zimmerman, New Paltz.
Jay W. Lee, New Woodstock.
Francis G. Van Emmerik, Oakdale Station.
George R. Hunter, Pine Plains.
Anne R. Cardona, Rocky Point.
George L. O'Marra, Romulus.
Catherine L. O'Leary, Roslyn Heights.
Archibald O. Abeel, Round Lake.
Virginia L. Paris, Sackets Harbor.
Margaret A. Dowd, Salamanca.
Leo B. Bennett, Schenectady.
Augustus D. Seeber, South Dayton.
Lewis S. Filkins, Stattdsburg.
John Newton Post, Stanfordsville.
Thomas F. Cunningham, Ticonderoga.
Robert B. Casey, Washingtonville.
Gail B. Liner, Wassail.
Charles O'Connor, Westbury.
Clifford J. Fleckenstein, West Valley.
George W. Probasco, Whitesville.
Edward B. Buckley, Willard.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles B. Linger, Terra Alta.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O heavenly Father, Giver of peace and rest to all mankind, look down upon Thy children. We pray that our labors may be great in their reality and appealing in their understanding. May we learn from the glory of our ancient faith the sacredness of life, the duty and the joy of righteous speech; thus may we reflect the holy life of Him whom we worship. We pray for faith triumphant even as the world is carrying in its breast the gushing fountain of poisonous hate, give us an increasing certainty that all things work together for good to them that love God. As we bravely face life with its countless distractions, crown us with an unfailing and unwithering strength of our holy religion. We praise Thee that neither height nor depth, nor any other creature can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Inspire us to adorn the House of Life with those fidelities which are the foretaste of the life eternal, in our Saviour's name, in love and mercy be Thou with our dear Speaker and the Congress and may no plague come nigh their dwelling places. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 16, 1940, was read and approved.

INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT ON JANUARY 20, 1941

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 32, the Chair appoints the following Members on the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the president-elect on January 20, 1941:

Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas, Mr. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 8, 1940, the Chair designates the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER], to read Washington's Farewell Address on February 22 next.

HON. J. H. (CYCLONE) DAVIS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce the death of a former very able and distinguished Member of this House, the Honorable J. H. (Cyclone) Davis, who served in this body in 1914-16 as Congressman at Large from Texas.

Judge Davis passed away January 31, 1940, at his home in Kaufman, Tex., following a lingering illness of 2 years.

Hon. James Harvey Davis was born in Pickens District, S. C., December 24, 1852, the son of W. B. and Salina Moore Davis, and came with his parents in early childhood to Winnsboro, Tex., where he lived until he attained manhood. Soon after his marriage to Miss Belle Barton, born in Bellview, Rusk County, Tex., December 1, 1853, the daughter of Col. James Mattison Barton and Emily Miller Barton, he with his bride became citizens of Mount Vernon, Tex., where he lived until 1892, at which time they moved to Sulphur Springs, Tex. With the exception of the 2-year residence in Washington, D. C., when Judge Davis was serving in Congress, he remained a resident of Sulphur Springs until 2 years before his death. Interment was made in the City Cemetery at Sulphur Springs, by the side of his first wife, Mrs. Belle Barton Davis, who died September 7, 1934.

The first bill ever to be introduced in Congress providing for drafting money the same as men in the event of war was introduced by Judge Davis during his service in Congress. The bill was introduced after many conferences with the then Secretary of War, the Honorable Newton Baker.

During his entire life he was a crusader for the poor, the weak, and the unfortunate. For this reason he was never a rich man in this world's goods, but he built a life that will be remembered long after riches would have been forgotten. He did not receive the credit that he was justly entitled to receive for helping to initiate and sell to the country many progressive and humane measures that have been adopted in recent years. But the people who knew him will not forget the many and great contributions that he made in their interest and for their welfare.

I am inserting herewith an Associated Press article that appeared in the newspapers of the Nation soon after his death which discloses his interesting career:

KAUFMAN, TEX., January 31.—J. H. (Cyclone) Davis, 85, one-time Texas Congressman at Large, and prohibition leader, died here Wednesday.

The bearded, widely-known politician lately had interested himself in old-age pension questions.

Survivors include his widow and four sons, Arlon B. (Cyclone) Davis, of Dallas; Valtan Davis and Roy Davis, of Sulphur Springs; and Landon Davis, of Hamlin; and a brother, Dr. Jeff Davis, of Roby.

It was in the Populist movement that blanketed the agrarian sections of the country in the decade before the turn of the century that Cyclone Davis attained his greatest prominence. He was one of the founders of the group that split from the old parties and grew into the Populist Party.

Davis, with evangelical zeal and burning oratory, threw himself into the movement that placed an aggressive bloc in Congress.

Davis won the brevet, "Cyclone," afterward made a part of his legal name, in upholding a cause of the farmers. In March 1894 he debated the question at issue with Watt Hardin, attorney general of Kentucky, in that State's capitol, and was described in a newspaper story as "a cyclone from Texas."

For years thereafter "the Honorable Cyclone Davis of Texas" was food for the impish humor of Dana's New York Sun, along with Simpson, "the sockless Socrates of Medicine Lodge."

Davis was brought to Texas when 2 years old by his parents, W. B. and Elma Davis, from South Carolina, where he was born December 24, 1853. He was educated in the district or "common" schools, as he defined them, and taught school 5 years, beginning at 21.

In 1879, when 26, he was licensed to practice law and, as county judge of Franklin County during the administration of Governor Roberts, was said to be the youngest man on the bench in Texas. He practiced law 20 years and published a newspaper 17 years. In the latter capacity he was one of the founders of the Texas Press Association and one of its early presidents.

Davis interested himself in politics at an early age, joining the old Grange when 19, and for many years was one of the leaders of farmers' movements. In 1884 Davis and a group of other friends of Thomas A. Hendricks won wide publicity at the Democratic National Convention for their "slinging bandanna" handkerchiefs, and the tall, bearded Texan clung to that symbol of the proletariat throughout his life. The convention of 1884 nominated Grover Cleveland and Hendricks, the first Democratic Presidential ticket elected since the Civil War.

Since 1934 Davis had been the only survivor of a group of 70 prominent workers in behalf of the election of William J. Bryan in the Presidential campaign of 1900.

The only public office Davis held outside his home region was Representative at Large in the Sixty-fourth and Sixty-fifth Congresses.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE AND THE DIESEL ENGINE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there is on the high seas at the present time the fastest freighter that ever sailed from a United States port flying the American flag. Known as the *Mormacpenn*, the ship is propelled by four 7-cylinder 2-cycle Busch-Sulzer Diesel engines and develops 9,000 horsepower. The engines were constructed by the Busch-Sulzer Diesel Engine Co., of St. Louis, the pioneers in the development of Diesel engines in this country.

Naturally the engines are the latest type of Diesels. The cost to the corporation of developing this engine was tremendous, requiring research work over a period of many years.

I have contended for years this country erred in not installing Diesel engines not only in its merchant marine but also in Navy ships and Army transports. It is said the German pocket battleships have engines somewhat similar in design to those of the *Mormacpenn*. Not only is it possible now to use the cheapest oil due to improvements, but the ship can fuel in New York and travel around the world without refueling. Economically Diesels operate much below the cost of the turbine-propelled vessel.

In its recent trials the *Mormacpenn* reached a speed of approximately 19½ knots, almost 2 knots above requirements. The ship will operate between New York and South American ports, is of 17,500 tons displacement, 492 feet in length, a cargo capacity of 690,000 cubic feet, 30,000 cubic feet being refrigerated. It is essentially a cargo vessel, but the ship contains four large staterooms that will accommodate eight passengers. The few passengers will be required to eat with the officers, there being no public rooms on the ship.

The *Mormacpenn* will reach Pernambuco in 9 days, Bahia in 10 days, Santos in 14 days, and Rio Grande do Sul in 17 days, arriving at Buenos Aires in 19 days. This is allowing time in each port for discharge and loading cargo. In the past our slow freighters handicapped our efforts to get South American trade, but thanks to the Maritime Commission's building program, many speedy cargo ships are now in the making.

The vessel is so constructed as to provide speedy conversion into a naval auxiliary in the event of war.

The multiengine geared Diesel design installed in the *Mormacpenn* lends itself to economical and safe operation more than any other type of ship propulsion, as it gives a wide range of ship speeds with machinery operating at most efficient power. In the case of a turbine vessel or a single direct-connected Diesel, fuel economy is seriously affected when the vessel has to run at slow speed. Also this design permits and

assists readiness to stop and back at full power, whereas the turbine vessel has less than 50 percent power astern. This design permits faster and safer maneuvering than does any other type.

Now, as to relative first cost. For years here in America there has been a greatly advertised antifactual propaganda spread around by some of the shipyards and other far-from-biased "authorities" that the first cost of a motorship was so much greater than that of a turbine vessel as to completely destroy the advantages of the former insofar as operating economy was concerned. This has been several times disproved by actual bids. There have been instances when yards have bid both ways—turbine versus Diesel—and in which the motorship price was larger than that of the steamer by more than the bid price of the Diesel engines. Such bids did not always come from yards equipped for building their own turbines, boilers, and so forth. Yards equipped to build steam machinery have a very good reason for preferring to build a steamer, as the latter permits productive use of expensive plant equipment which would be idle were the yard to have to buy Diesel engines.

The only yard at present equipped to build Diesels has frequently bid turbine or Diesel drive at the same price; at times it has bid lower for motorship construction.

In carrying out its building program for furnishing the large number of greatly needed American merchant vessels of several classes, types, and sizes, the Maritime Commission wisely decided to develop modern ships of Diesel as well as turbine propulsion. I here quote a paragraph from an article prepared by Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, for publication in the August 1939 Marine Engineering and Shipping Review:

There are two major contributions by the Commission to the technical development of the shipbuilding industry. One is the high-pressure, high-temperature steam turbine power plant which is being experimentally installed in one of the Commission's C-3 type vessels. The other is not so much a development as a recognition—a recognition of the value and feasibility of the Diesel engine in all kinds of American merchant vessels. Before the Maritime Commission's building program got under way Diesel installations in this country were relatively few. Shipbuilders were equipped to build steam turbine ships. They had been building them for many years and saw no reason why they should humor the occasional ship operator who preferred the efficiency or the cleanliness of the Diesel.

As Admiral Land says, the Diesel engine has finally been recognized. This recognition has been a long time on the way, but powerful interests from a selfish standpoint have left nothing undone to defeat efforts to advance the Diesel. History of ship construction shows the success that resulted from their campaigns, but by actual performance I predict the Diesel will demonstrate it is superior from every standpoint.

I have addressed myself on this subject several times in the past, my first remarks being made 10 years ago.

I sought recognition for the Diesel over this period and was bitterly disappointed when the three new ships for the Panama Line, a Government-owned corporation, were constructed. It so happened that I was responsible for the construction of those ships. I sailed on two of the old Panama Line ships, used as cargo ships during the construction of the Panama Canal and reconstructed as cargo passenger ships after the Canal was completed. They had outlived their usefulness, were extremely slow, but so constructed as to be able to weather a severe storm, many of which they had encountered in their years of service. In talking to the captains of the ships and also to the Governor of the Canal Zone, I learned there was a special replacement fund in the Treasury amounting to several millions of dollars that could only be used to replace these ships.

On my return to Washington I contacted the President. During our conversation I could see he doubted that I knew what I was talking about when I told him I found money in the Treasury that could only be allocated for ship construction. He promised to investigate and shortly thereafter he wrote me and advised he had ordered the ships replaced with money from this special fund which he found as I told him he would. Knowing the President's interest in ships I talked to him about installing Diesel engines in the new vessels. A private naval architect was employed and in

the end the old turbine lobby again used its influence with the result that turbines rather than Diesels propelled the ships.

HISTORY OF THE DIESEL ENGINE

After 17 years of study and experimentation Dr. Rudolph Diesel, of Munich, Germany, in 1897, completed a successful new type of power-producing engine with a higher thermal efficiency than any other type that has been produced before or since.

In collaboration with the engineers of Krupp, and Augsburg Machine Works, of Germany, Sulzer Bros., of Switzerland, and Mr. Adolphus Busch, of St. Louis, Dr. Diesel developed the commercial engine that bears his name. Although the outstanding advantages of this new type of power-producing engine were at once recognized, it took about 10 years to introduce the Diesel in small sizes and another 10 years for it to gain a position as a serious competitor of steam engines, which had become well established as the accepted type of power plant.

During the past 40 years the Diesel engine has been thoroughly tried out in both stationary and marine service, and has shown a thermal efficiency which has never been approached by any other type of heat engine. In the average steam plant less than 15 percent of the heat energy contained in fuel is converted into mechanical energy; in the largest and most modern steam plants less than 25 percent of the heat energy contained in fuel is converted into mechanical energy; while in the Diesel engine, with utilization of waste heat in cooling water and exhaust gases, over 40 percent of the heat energy contained in the fuel is converted into mechanical energy.

In those countries in Europe where cheap fuel is not available, stationary Diesel engine power plants have been widely installed. Chile has an interconnected Diesel power plant system of over 40,000 horsepower. In Shanghai, China, is a 37,000 horsepower stationary Diesel plant.

But the greatest adoption of the Diesel engine has been for the propulsion of ships which must carry their own fuel. As the Diesel burns less fuel than steam engines with the same amount of fuel bunker, the ship can carry more cargo or can purchase fuel in the port of call where fuel is cheapest in price and bunker sufficient for the round voyage. Also the Diesel propelling engine takes up less space than the steam plant. It requires no warming up, while a steam plant must be slowly fired several hours before being placed in operation. Again the simple Diesel engine is self-contained, without such extensive auxiliary apparatus as steam boilers and condensers that are necessary for the steam engine, and therefore the Diesel propelling plant requires a smaller operating crew.

With the trend toward high-speed ocean transportation the cost of fuel has become an ever-increasing part of the cost of ship operation, and because of its greater efficiency and lower consumption of fuel the Diesel has to a great degree superseded steam for the propulsion of medium-size ocean-going passenger and cargo ships.

The unit size of Diesel engines has been rapidly increased. Some German cruisers are fitted with a Diesel plant. Superliners, requiring from 100,000 to 150,000 horsepower, are fitted with steam turbines, although it appears possible that at no distant date Diesels will be developed for even such size plants.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DIESEL ENGINE

It was a St. Louisian, the late Mr. Adolphus Busch, who was directly responsible for the advent of the American Diesel-engine industry.

It was Mr. Busch who purchased from Dr. Diesel in 1897 exclusive rights to the Diesel engine for the United States and Canada. He built at St. Louis in 1898 the first Diesel in the world to be placed in commercial service. From 1898 until the expiration of his basic Diesel patents in 1911 Mr. Busch pioneered alone in Diesel building in America, building several hundred stationary engines for installation in public-utility and industrial plants.

Dr. Diesel, from 1898 until his death in 1913, continued—as advisory engineer, director, and stockholder—his close

association with the Busch enterprise, the only American industry in which Dr. Diesel ever participated, or with which he ever cooperated.

After the expiration of the basic Diesel patents other American manufacturers began building Diesel engines, until today there are over 50 American Diesel builders. The leading American firms have made arrangements for collaboration with leading European firms, especially in late years, when the more general adoption of the Diesel abroad has resulted in revolutionary development of new types of improved design and higher efficiency.

Mainly due to the abundance of cheap coal in this country, the Diesel was not so rapidly adopted for stationary power plants as it was in other countries.

In the United States there are now thousands of public-utility Diesel power plants.

One outstanding feature of the Diesel engine is that it eliminates smoke and ashes and requires only a small water supply.

Oil fuel has taken the place of coal in many sections of the world, and almost entirely is this true in speaking of vessels constructed by the leading maritime nations. Foreign countries long since saw the wisdom of installing Diesel engines in their ships, but it was not until the Maritime Commission came into being that the Diesel received any reasonable recognition in this country. Successful operation of the many ships now under construction in this country that will be propelled by Diesels will in the end compel this country as well as private shipowners when constructing ships to install nothing but Diesel engines.

There is in the making at the present time plans and specifications for the construction of an Army transport. I have already called to the attention of the Secretary of War the successful operation of the Diesel engine. This transport on every trip will pass through the Panama Canal and cross the Pacific. From the standpoint of economy in operation, the War Department will be more than justified in insisting Diesel engines be installed in this vessel. With large corporations constructing Diesel engines in every section of the country, competition in bidding is assured.

In a recent statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Admiral Emory S. Land, chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, said in part:

The Maritime Commission is seeking to restore the American merchant fleet to its earlier vigor. This in substance, it was directed to do by the Congress. Looking toward that end, it has undertaken a long-range construction program, also at the direction of the Congress. The fundamental purpose is to assure the country of a modern, efficient, and aggressive merchant fleet. We need it for our foreign trade in peace and for the transportation of strategic war materials and as a naval auxiliary in war.

The Commission was created in 1936. Its basic program calls for the construction of 500 ships over a 10-year period. The new vessels are to provide replacements for obsolete ships and additions to the fleet where necessary. And I would like to emphasize that we did not undertake this program before making a very careful study of the entire merchant-marine problem. Upon the conclusions reached in that study we based our construction program. In other words, it was not an idea hatched in haste by an independent Government agency to be repented at leisure when funds were denied. Its principle was insisted upon by the Congress; its details were supplied by us.

The question is frequently asked, What will we do with all these ships?

Another which has been heard in the public forum is, With all our ships being laid up, why are we wasting all this money building new ones?

The answer to the first is, we are going to use them. The 20 completed are already in service, and operators are waiting for more.

The answer to the second is, we are not laying up "all our ships" or even a considerable handful.

The fact is, we could use more new ships than we now have available. And when I say use I mean sell to American operators.

I would like to state that the first type of ship which we have turned out has been proven the most efficient of its kind in the world. Compared, for instance, with the Hog Island vessel of the last war, the new one is 50 percent faster, yet it consumes fuel at less than half the rate of the old ship. Briefly, gentlemen, that means that modern American brains and technical skill have turned out a type of ship which, compared to her predecessor of 20 years ago, will save in fuel alone 35 to 40 percent of the entire construction cost over the ship's 20-year economic life span.

Of this type we are building 40. The record will show that we could sell more than 40.

I am sure that the members of this committee understand the importance of this increased vessel efficiency developed by the Commission both in its relation to economy of operation for commercial purposes and to the national defense, which is thereby assured of a fast and able auxiliary.

Mr. Speaker, the days of experimentation insofar as the Diesel engine is concerned are behind us. What we want now is not only a navy second to none but a merchant marine second to none. That can be accomplished by the construction of vessels of the best and most efficient type, fitted and equipped with the most modern, most efficient, and the most economical engines, machinery, and commercial appliances. It has been demonstrated the most efficient and economical engines are Diesels. Nothing but Diesels should be installed in our new cargo ships and transports, and we should also start placing them in Navy vessels.

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include therein certain statements of Admiral Land before a Senate committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Gov. Roy E. Ayers, of Montana, before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made by me in Chicago at a road convention, relative to highways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

WESTERN OR OLD SETTLER CHEROKEES

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the matter provided for in the bill (H. R. 4498) for the relief of the Western or Old Settler Cherokees, and for other purposes, has been taken care of in the Deficiency Act of August 9, 1939, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received by me from the Polish American Council, Chicago, Ill., with reference to Polish relief in Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA ORANGES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes there will be delivered to the two cloakrooms some boxes of oranges which I have arranged to have come here from the very heart of the district which I represent. [Applause.]

I hope that everybody will enjoy the oranges and I hope, as you eat them, you will remember the contributions that California has made to the welfare of the United States and the contribution that she is now making, and as we come to you from time to time to appeal to you to understand our problems, that you may remember the sweetness of these oranges and that it may symbolize in your mind the good will of our great State. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an

article that appeared in the Foreign Service magazine entitled "Legislative Hurdles."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial on the subject of freight rates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Atlanta Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA YOUTH LEGISLATURE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by printing a certain resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a resolution adopted by the State Council of the California Youth Legislature at their meeting held in Fresno, Calif., February 3 and 4, 1940. This resolution opposes Army recruiting within the National Youth Administration.

I wish to state that I agree with these young people in their opposition to such practice. When I recall that there is a great demand to militarize the C. C. C., and that both the N. Y. A. and C. C. C. are made up of those who come from the lowest economic strata of society, I become alarmed at the trend.

Is it possible that we are planning to make cannon fodder of those whom industry and commerce cannot use? Is the Army going to be allowed to send smooth-talking recruiting officers into the midst of these young people, most of whom are busily engaged in completing their education? Are these young folks to be talked into enlisting into the service at the expense of the betterment of their mental training?

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not opposed to Army service. We need a well-trained Army in these troubled times.

What I am opposed to is the trend toward making one class of our society bear the burden for all classes. These young people who by accident of birth are the children of parents of victims of a fast-changing society should not bear the burden of protecting the lives and property of other young folk whose parents still are fortunate enough to have a fortune or a job. If the national safety demands recruits and the Army is unable to get them through the regular channels let us go about the matter in a way in keeping with a democracy. Let us not take advantage of the unfortunate situation of these people and induce them to do something they might regret for the remainder of their lives. After all, this business of being a soldier is a pretty serious undertaking these days.

There are those who claim that it is a great privilege to have the training that the Army gives and that the children of the poor are fortunate, indeed, to have the opportunity. To these I say, "If it is a good thing for the poor it is equally good for the well-to-do and the rich," and a cross section of all society should be the recipient of all the benefits this training affords. I would much prefer conscription to such undemocratic method as is to be used. Even Hitler plays no favorites when it comes to bearing the military burden.

I compliment the California Youth Legislature for its alertness in detecting undemocratic trends.

Resolution adopted by State Council of California Youth Legislature, meeting in Fresno, February 3-4, 1940, on Army recruiting and National Youth Administration

Whereas Army recruiting officers have been given the authority to demand and obtain from the National Youth Administration complete lists of the youth workers employed by National Youth Administration at any time, for the purposes of recruiting them into the Army; and

Whereas upon the demand of the Army, the National Youth Administration is to arrange and sponsor meetings of its youth

employees, so that Army representatives may come to them for the purpose of recruiting them into the Army; and

Whereas such control by the Army of the civilian departments of the Government constitutes a threat to democratic government, the beginning of military regimentation of government administration; and

Whereas such control further constitutes the start of the militarization of American youth, and therefore is a threat to the freedom and civil rights of young people; and

Whereas the President of the United States is responsible for the administration of the Army and the National Youth Administration; and even he has not the right to so alter the purposes and functions of the National Youth Administration, which are defined by law as for the relief of needy young people; and

Whereas we vigorously oppose all steps toward militarization of the American people: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State Council of the California Youth Legislature demand that:

1. National Youth Administrator Williams instantly withdraw his order authorizing the furnishing of lists by National Youth Administration to the Army; and authorizing the use of National Youth Administration for other military purposes.

2. The Secretary of War forbid the intrusion of his subordinates into the operation of the civilian departments.

3. The President issue appropriate orders to carry out the foregoing, and notify the employees of National Youth Administration of his action, so they will be able to resume their work and study with reasonable hope and security; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the administrators of the Federal Security Agency, and the National Youth Administration, and the National Youth Administration of California; and to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; the American Youth Congress; and the press.

REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is evidently going to hold its convention in the dark this year. They have just issued a long document, a preliminary platform, in which they completely dodge the power question, except to attack the T. V. A. and its yardstick, about which they show they know practically nothing, offer no relief from the exorbitant electric light and power rates the people are now paying, and promise no help for rural electrification, a matter in which farmers are most vitally interested.

I submit that this document ought to be published in Braille so that they can read it in the dark in their convention, because if they follow out the policy this platform indicates they would impose on the American people; that convention will be a complete blackout. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief communication from a businessman on the business situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech I delivered at Fremont, W. Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article from the Bel Air Daily Leader of January 22, 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing a copy of a speech I delivered at Chattanooga, Tenn., in celebration of Lincoln's Birthday, and likewise by printing a copy of a resolution or memorial relating to the late Representative J. Will Taylor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an address delivered by Mr. Frank Gannett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I was granted consent to address the House today at the conclusion of the legislative program. I ask unanimous consent that that privilege be moved up to Friday, February 23.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

SCHOOL FUNDS FOR WAPATO SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 54, YAKIMA COUNTY, WASH.

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, (H. R. 3824) to provide funds for cooperation with Wapato School District No. 54, Yakima County, Wash., for extension of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children of the Yakima Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF NECESSARY EXPENSES INCURRED BY QUINAIELT INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2654, authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinaielt Reservation, State of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 643, may be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the attorneys of record for those Quinaielt Indians who received their allotments on the Quinaielt Reservation, State of Washington, pursuant to judgments or decrees of a United States district or appellate court in a case wherein they were named parties plaintiff, the reasonable and fair value of the services rendered and expenses incurred, as heretofore fixed and determined by said Secretary; and the sum of \$35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to make said payments, the amount so paid for the account of each allottee to be reimbursed to the United States out of any funds now or hereafter accruing to the account of each such Indian allottee from the sale of his or her allotment, or the timber thereon.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the Senate bill to make it conform to the House bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: On page 2, line 1, strike out "\$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$28,400.10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A House bill (H. R. 2654) was laid on the table.

RAILROADS IN THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4868, to amend the act authorizing the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES INDIAN SERVICE TO MAKE ARRESTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5409, to authorize certain officers of the United States Indian Service to make arrests in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1821, to provide for the payment in full of the principal of awards of the Special Mixed Claims Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very meritorious bill. It has been on the calendar for a long time. Many American citizens who suffered damages and financial loss are very much interested in the passage of this bill. It has been passed over two or three times now. This is a bill in which many people throughout this country are deeply interested. Unless my friend has some objection to the bill itself, I hope he will not press his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I hope the gentleman will indulge me. He has caught me somewhat unaware, because my notes on it are in my office, but I think I could convince the gentleman if I had my notes here that there were valid objections. I wish the gentleman would not object to letting it go over without prejudice. If the gentleman will confer with me later, possibly he can remove some of the objections I have before the calendar is called next time. I am very willing to take into consideration the gentleman's suggestions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, in view of the gentleman's statement, I will not object on this occasion.

Mr. FISH. May I inquire of the gentleman what his views are on this bill, because I sometimes agree with him and I would like to know whether I agree with him now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the fact that my friend from New York admits that he sometimes agrees with me is accepted by me as the highest compliment that I could receive. I will be frank and say that I agree with the gentleman from New York frequently.

Mr. FISH. Then I am sure we must be in accord. What is this discussion we are now engaged in?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is not the gentleman aware of the parliamentary situation?

Mr. FISH. No. I would like to be led by the distinguished gentleman once in a while. I am trying to get the facts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman followed me the other day, and I think we were both in a good cause.

Mr. FISH. And we will win in the end, because we are right, and righteousness and truth always prevail.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think so, because diplomatic relations, for all practical purposes, were broken with Russia by the recent speech of the Chief Executive.

I think the bill is a good one. It is to recompense American citizens who received damages years ago, or the heirs of those killed or who have died. It came out of the gentleman's Committee on Foreign Affairs. It has been passed over three times. I think it is a meritorious bill.

Mr. FISH. How much money does this involve?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am informed the amount of the bill is \$2,598,000.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. To my mind, it is not so much a question of the amount of the claim as it is the justness of the claim. I have personal knowledge of many of these claims and acquaintance with a lot of the people along the Mexican border who sustained serious losses. Some of my constituents in El Paso and along the Mexican border have waited patiently for years for action in this matter. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has approved this bill. My recollection is that a similar bill has passed the Senate. It seems to me that in all fairness and in all justice some action ought to be taken. These people have a right to know whether they are ever going to recover some of the money to which they are justly entitled. These claimants are innocent in the matter, and it is only fair that the bill be taken up and also debated and voted upon. I hope my friend will not object.

Mr. FISH. Does this include the claim of the Illinois Central Railroad?

Mr. THOMASON. I am not sure who all the claimants are, for I do not have the bill before me at this minute. I do know that many American citizens sustained losses and have never received a cent. They are entitled to have this bill heard and considered. I know that it has much merit in it.

Mr. FISH. Is this the bill that requires the United States to dig into the Federal Treasury and pay out money that some foreign government has never paid us? If that is the precedent we are setting, I am absolutely against this bill and find myself forced against my will to differ with my friend from Massachusetts, whom I like so much.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] knows that this is a bill that has been taken up by the committee. I believe the gentleman from New York voted for it. It covers claims that have been brought before the Department and of which they have approved. There is no reason why this bill should not go through at the present time.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under reservation of objection, I may state that I have no objection to the bills going over this time, but the next time it comes up I will object to a similar request.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under those conditions I object to the request. We might as well bring the matter to a head now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FISH, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. CHURCH objected.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY EXPOSITION

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 242, to authorize the appropriation of an additional sum of

\$606,650 for Federal participation in the world's fair to be held by the San Francisco Bay Exposition, Inc., in the city of San Francisco during the year 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MEXICAN CLAIMS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 326, for the payment of awards and appraisals heretofore made in favor of citizens of the United States on claims presented under the General Claims Convention of September 8, 1923, United States and Mexico.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5784, to provide for the conservation and transfer of accumulated sick leave and vacation time due classified civil-service employees who succeed to the position of postmaster, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every classified civil-service employee in a first- or second-class post office who shall be appointed to the position of postmaster shall retain to his credit whatever amount of sick leave and vacation time is properly due him on the date of his appointment to the position of postmaster: *Provided*, That such accumulated sick leave and vacation time shall be transferred to the credit of the employee as of the date of his appointment as postmaster in the same manner as the time might have been utilized by him before appointment: *Provided further*, That this act shall be retroactive to the extent that every postmaster at a first- or second-class post office who shall have received appointment as postmaster while an employee of the classified civil-service and who shall hold the position of postmaster on the date this act becomes effective, shall be entitled to the benefits of the act and shall be credited with the amount of accumulated sick leave and vacation time which was due him on the date of his appointment as postmaster: *Provided further*, That all laws and parts of laws inconsistent with this act shall be repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "in a first- or second-class post office".

On page 2, line 13, strike out the words "shall be" and insert in lieu thereof the words "are hereby".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERITORIOUS SERVICE MEDAL FOR CIVIL SERVICE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1582, to authorize the President to bestow a meritorious service medal upon civil-service officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]?

Mr. FADDIS and Mr. RAMSPECK objected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. FADDIS objected.

GOOD BEHAVIOR OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5939, to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

ERECTION OF MONUMENT TO MEMORY OF FATHER PIERRE GIBAULT

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 219, to provide for the erection of a monument to the memory of the patriot priest, Father Pierre Gibault.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of \$50,000 be, and the same is hereby, authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the erection of a monument to the memory of the patriot priest, Father Pierre Gibault, at Cahokia, in the State of Illinois, with the advice of the Commissioner of Fine Arts. The said sum shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the county of Saint Clair or the citizens thereof shall cede and convey to the United States such suitable site as may in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior be required for said monument: *And provided further*, That the United States shall have no responsibility for the care and upkeep of the monument.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Commissioner" and insert "Commission."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 57, authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a completion of surveys, test borings, and foundation investigations to be made to determine the advisability and cost of putting in a small experimental plant for development of tidal power in the waters in and about Passamaquoddy Bay, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such examinations.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

EXPEDITIOUS SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES WITH THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6324, to provide for the more expeditious settlement of disputes with the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact a rule has been requested for the consideration of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONS TO SEQUOIA NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1790, to authorize additions to the Sequoia National Forest, Calif., through exchanges under the act of March 20, 1922, or by proclamation or Executive order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

CROP INSURANCE FOR COTTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6972, to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

OSAGE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6314, authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States.

LXXXVI—103

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW INDIANS LEASING OF UNDEVELOPED COAL AND ASPHALT DEPOSITS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7135, to authorize the leasing of undeveloped coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized to lease any of the unsold and undeveloped coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma, in accordance with the terms of the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), except as otherwise provided herein, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. Leases made under this act may be for any term not to exceed 15 years.

Sec. 2. That the rate of royalty in coal leases made under this act shall not be less than 10 cents per ton on all coal mined, including what is commonly known as slack: *Provided*, That such leases shall require the mining of a minimum of 1,000 tons each year the first and second years after approval of the lease, 3,000 tons the third year, 5,000 tons the fourth year, and 15,000 tons the fifth and each succeeding year thereafter, or the payment of royalty thereon the same as if the coal had actually been mined: *Provided further*, That the lessee shall pay as advance royalty on each lease the sum of \$100 each year for the first and second years, \$300 for the third year, and \$500 for the fourth and each year thereafter. The advance royalty paid for any year may be credited on the royalty becoming due on coal mined during the year for which said advance royalty has been paid, but shall not be credited on royalty on coal mined in any previous or subsequent year.

Sec. 3. That the rate of royalty in asphalt leases made under this act shall not be less than 15 cents per ton on all crude asphalt mined: *Provided*, That such leases shall require the mining of a minimum of 10,000 tons the first year after approval of the lease and 15,000 tons each year thereafter, or the payment of royalty thereon the same as if the asphalt had been mined: *Provided further*, That the lessee shall pay as advance royalty on each lease the sum of \$500 in advance for each year. The advance royalty paid for any year may be credited on the royalty becoming due on asphalt mined during the year for which said advance royalty had been paid but shall not be credited on royalty on asphalt mined in any previous or subsequent year.

Sec. 4. That the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), is hereby amended to provide that leases made thereunder may be for any term not to exceed 15 years.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "lease", insert "to the highest responsible competitive bidder."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL UNITED STATES JUDGES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7079, to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. VREELAND, and Mr. CHURCH objected.

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7267, to facilitate the procurement of aircraft for the national defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2868, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1941, whenever contracts are to be awarded as a result of competitive bids for furnishing the War Department or the Navy Department with aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to award a contract for the aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories to be purchased as a result of any such competition to the bidder that the said Secretary shall find to be the lowest responsible bidder that can satisfactorily perform

the work or service required to the best advantage of the Government, or in his discretion and when such action is considered necessary by the said Secretary in the interest of the national defense, to award contracts for such aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories to such bidders, not exceeding three in number, as said Secretary shall find to be the lowest responsible bidders that can satisfactorily perform the work or the service required to the best advantage of the Government. The determinations as to such multiple awards and the necessity for making the same shall be based upon quality, times and rate of delivery, price, and the prevention of the overloading of a plant or plants, and such division of awards shall be made only when found by the said Secretary to be in the interest of the national defense: *Provided*, That no awards shall be made at prices in excess of those offered by the bidders in any such competition, and that the decision of the Secretary of the Department concerned as to the award of any such contract, or contracts, the interpretation of the provisions thereof, and the application and administration of the same shall not be reviewable, otherwise than as may be therein provided for, by any officer or tribunal of the United States except the President and the Federal courts: *Provided further*, That a report shall be made to the Congress by the Secretary of the Department concerned in the case of any competition as a result of which quantity contracts are entered into under authority of this act with more than one bidder immediately upon the execution of such contracts, setting forth the articles purchased, the prices paid therefor, the name or names of each bidder and of each contractor receiving a contract, and the particular reasons for awarding each of such contracts: *Provided further*, That any contract entered into under the authority hereby granted for the construction of any complete aircraft or any portion thereof shall be subject to the applicable profit-limitation provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 505), as amended by the act of June 25, 1936 (49 Stat. 1926), and as further amended by the act of April 3, 1939 (Public, No. 18, 76th Cong.): *Provided further*, That procurement of aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor shall be made under authority of this act only when in the opinion of the Secretary of the Department concerned such action is necessary in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the authority herein granted shall not be construed to abrogate, repeal, or suspend any of the provisions of Revised Statutes (3709, U. S. C. 41: 5), the act of March 2, 1901 (31 Stat. 905), the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 787), section 14 of the act of April 3, 1939 (Public, No. 18, 76th Cong.), or of the act of July 13, 1939 (Public, No. 168, 76th Cong.), or to prohibit the award of any contracts in any manner now authorized by law, but shall be construed as additional legislation to be utilized under the conditions herein set forth during the effective period of this act: *And provided further*, That this act shall be applicable under the conditions herein set forth to awards of contracts upon which competitive bids have been heretofore requested or received but as a result of which contracts have not been awarded.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A House bill (H. R. 7267) was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3759, to authorize a National Mississippi River Parkway and matters relating thereto.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL LAND POLICY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1675, to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BURDICK. I object to the request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill calls for a total cost of \$120,000,000 annually. I believe it is too important a bill to be considered on the Consent Calendar. For that reason I object.

KIOWA, COMANCHE, AND APACHE TRIBES JURISDICTIONAL ACT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) referring the claims of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma to the Court of Claims for finding of fact and report to Congress.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE OR FERRY ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT BOCA CHICA, TEX.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3138, authorizing J. E. Pate, his successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or ferry across the Rio Grande River at Boca Chica, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the Postal Service, and for other purposes, J. E. Pate, his successors and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or ferry and approaches thereto across the Rio Grande River, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Boca Chica, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject also to the approval of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, El Paso, Tex., and of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon J. E. Pate, his successors and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge or ferry and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State of Texas upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

Sec. 3. The said J. E. Pate, his successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge or ferry in accordance with any laws of Texas applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

Sec. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to J. E. Pate, his successors and assigns; and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

Sec. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after "Rio Grande", strike out "River."

Page 3, after line 9, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 5. J. E. Pate, his successors and assigns, shall promptly provide and maintain, without expense to the Government, such suitable and conveniently located facilities as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Federal agency or agencies, stationed at the bridge or ferry, to discharge properly its, or their, legal functions relating to the regulation and supervision of commerce with foreign nations. The suitability and convenience of location of the facilities shall be determined by the head of the Federal agency concerned. The word 'facilities' as used in this act means inspection quarters, together with heat, light, and sanitation facilities. In the event of the neglect, failure, or refusal to furnish facilities in pursuance of the provisions of this act, the head of any department affected by such neglect, failure, or refusal is hereby authorized to close the bridge or ferry to all traffic until such time as the said facilities shall have been furnished."

Page 4, line 1, strike out "5" and insert "6."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing J. E. Pate, his successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or ferry across the Rio Grande at Boca Chica, Tex."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEVIL'S DEN SPRINGS, GA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4040, declaring Devil's Den Springs, in Decatur County, Ga., to be nonnavigable.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT OR NEAR FLORENCE STATION, CITY OF OMAHA, NEBR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7069, authorizing Douglas County, Nebr., to construction, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Florence Station, in the city of Omaha, Nebr.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHANGING THE DESIGNATION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN NATIONAL PARK, KY., AND THE FORT M'HENRY NATIONAL PARK, MD.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5573, to change the designation of Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that a Senate bill (S. 2046) has been passed and is now public law 383, which deals with the same item contained in this bill. As a result, I do not believe this legislation will be necessary. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the calendar and laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT OF EMPLOYEES OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1850, to aid the States and Territories in making provisions for the retirement of employees of the land-grant colleges.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, pursuant to the recognized obligations of governments to guarantee the social security of their employees and in order to provide for the retirement on an annuity, or otherwise, of all persons being paid salaries in whole or in part from grants of Federal funds to the several States and Territories pursuant to the terms of the Act approved July 2, 1862, for the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, and acts supplementary thereto providing for instruction in agriculture and mechanic arts, for the establishment of agricultural experiment stations, and for cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics, all States and Territories are hereafter authorized, notwithstanding any contrary provisions in said acts, to withhold from expenditure, from Federal funds advanced under the terms of said acts, amounts designated as employer contributions to be made by the States or Territories to retirement systems established in accordance with the laws of such States or Territories, or established by the governing boards of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts in accordance with the authority vested in them, and to deposit such amounts to the credit of such retirement systems for subsequent disbursement in accordance with the terms of the retirement systems in effect in the respective States and Territories: *Provided*, That there shall not be deducted from Federal funds and deposited to the credit of retirement accounts as employer contributions, amounts in excess of 5 percent of that portion of the salaries of employees paid from such Federal funds: *Provided further*, That, for the purpose of making deposits and contributions in retirement systems in favor of any employee, in no event shall the deductions from any Federal fund advanced pursuant to the foregoing acts be in greater proportion to the total deductions for such employee than the salary received under such Federal funds bears to the total salary from Federal sources: *Provided further*, That the deposits and contributions from funds of Federal origin to any retirement system established by a State or a land-grant college must be at least equalled by the total contributions thereto on the part of the individuals concerned, the State, and the counties: *And provided further*, That no deductions for the foregoing purposes shall be made from Federal funds in support of employees appointed pursuant to the terms of the foregoing acts, whose salaries are paid wholly by the States or Territories: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any employee paid in whole or in part from Federal funds who may be subject to the United States Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSAGE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 288 authorizing the Osage Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I object to that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. COSTELLO objected.

LIMITATION OF PRESENT LAWS WITH RESPECT TO COUNSEL IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7032, to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF INDIANS WHO HAVE PAID TAXES ON ALLOTTED LANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 952, for the relief of Indians who have paid taxes on allotted lands for which patents in fee were issued without application by or consent of the allottees and subsequently canceled, and for the reimbursement of public subdivisions by whom judgments for such claims have been paid.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I object to that request.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say that I am doing this at the request of the author of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. CHURCH objected.

SISETON AND WAHPETON BANDS OF SIOUX INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 793, authorizing payment to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians for certain lands ceded by them to the United States by a treaty of July 23, 1851.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I object to that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. COSTELLO objected.

ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1975, to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Acts of March 14, 1936.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 2876) be substituted for the House bill.

There being no objection, the clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the days of annual leave with pay provided for in the act of March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1161), and the days of sick leave with pay provided for in the act of March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1162), shall mean days upon which employees would otherwise work and receive pay, and shall be exclusive of Sundays which do not occur within a regular tour of duty, holidays, and all nonwork days established by Federal statute or by Executive or administrative order.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A House bill (H. R. 1975) was laid on the table.

ABLE SEAMEN ON SAILING VESSELS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7339, to exempt sail vessels from the provisions of section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended, requiring the manning of certain merchant vessels by able seamen, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no provision of section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, Supp. IV, title 46, sec. 672), relating to the manning of certain vessels with respect to able seamen, shall apply to any sail vessel: *Provided, however,* That at least 65 percent of the deck crew of any sail vessel operating on the high seas shall be composed of persons who have served for a period of not less than 6 months in the deck crew of sail vessels to which this act applies: *Provided, however,* That the exemption of sail vessels from the provisions of section 13 of the Seamen's Act of March 4, 1915, as amended, shall not apply to sail vessels carrying passengers for hire.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, following line 14, insert a new section to be known as section 2, as follows:

"Sec. 2. Any violation of this act by the owner, master, or officer in charge of the vessel shall subject the owner of such vessel to a penalty of not less than \$100 and not more than \$500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLISIONS OF VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7420) to amend laws for preventing collisions of vessels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That article 11 of section 1 of the act of June 7, 1897 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 180), be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Art. 11. A vessel under 150 feet in length when at anchor shall carry forward, where it can best be seen, but at a height not exceeding 20 feet above the hull, a white light in a lantern so constructed as to show a clear, uniform, and unbroken light visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least 1 mile: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Commerce may, after investigation, designate such areas as he may deem proper as 'special anchorage areas'; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of Commerce shall deem such change or abolition in the interest of navigation: *Provided further,* That vessels not more than 65 feet in length when at anchor in any such special anchorage area shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this article.

"A vessel of 150 feet or upward in length, when at anchor, shall carry in the forward part of the vessel, at a height of not less than 20 and not exceeding 40 feet above the hull, one such light, and at or near the stern of the vessel, and at such a height that it shall be not less than 15 feet lower than the forward light, another such light.

"The length of a vessel shall be deemed to be the length appearing in her certificate of registry.

"A vessel aground in or near a fairway shall carry the above light or lights and the two red lights prescribed by article 4 (a)."

Sec. 2. Rule 9 of section 1 of the act of February 8, 1895, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 258), be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"RULE 9. A vessel under 150 feet register length, when at anchor, shall carry forward, where it can best be seen, but at a height not exceeding 20 feet above the hull, a white light constructed so as to show a clear, uniform, and unbroken light visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least 1 mile: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Commerce may, after investigation, designate such areas as he may deem proper as 'special anchorage areas'; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of Commerce shall deem such change or abolition in the interest of navigation: *Provided further,* That vessels not more than 65 feet in length, when at anchor, in any such special anchorage area shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this article.

"A vessel of 150 feet or upward in register length, when at anchor, shall carry in the forward part of the vessel two white lights at the same height of not less than 20 and not exceeding 40 feet above the hull and not less than 10 feet apart horizontally and athwartships, except that each need not be visible all around the horizon but so arranged that one or the other, or both, shall show a clear, uniform, and unbroken light and be visible from any angle of approach at a distance of at least 1 mile; and at or near the stern of the vessel two similar lights, similarly arranged and at such a height that they shall not be less than 15 feet lower than the forward lights. In addition the four anchor lights above specified, at least one white deck light shall be displayed in every interval of 100 feet along the deck, measuring from the forward lights, said deck lights

to be not less than 2 feet above the deck and arranged, so far as intervening structures will permit, so as to be visible from any angle of approach."

Sec. 3. Rule 10 of section 4233 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 319), be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"RULE 10. All vessels, whether steam vessels or sail vessels, when at anchor in roadsteads or fairways, shall, between sunset and sunrise, exhibit where it can best be seen, but at a height not exceeding 20 feet above the hull, a white light in a globular lantern of 8 inches in diameter, and so constructed as to show a clear, uniform, and unbroken light, visible all around the horizon, and at a distance of at least 1 mile: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Commerce may, after investigation, designate such areas as he may deem proper as 'special anchorage areas'; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of Commerce shall deem such change or abolition in the interest of navigation: *Provided further,* That vessels not more than 65 feet in length when at anchor in any such special anchorage area shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this article."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 12, strike out the word "Commerce" and insert the word "War";

Page 2, line 1, following the comma after the word "investigation" insert the following: "by rule, regulation, or order,";

Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "Commerce" and insert the word "War";

Page 2, strike out lines 19 to 21, inclusive;

Page 3, line 7, strike out the word "Commerce" and insert the word "War";

Page 3, line 7, following the comma after the word "investigation" insert the following: "by rule, regulation, or order,";

Page 3, line 11, strike out the word "Commerce" and insert the word "War";

Page 4, line 21, strike out the word "Commerce" and insert the word "War";

Page 4, line 21, following the comma after the word "investigation" insert the following: "by rule, regulation, or order,";

Page 4, line 24, strike out the word "Commerce" beginning at the end of that line and continuing on page 5, line 1, and insert the word "War."

The committee amendments were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MARKERS FOR CERTAIN GRAVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8083) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish certain markers for certain graves.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of existing law the Secretary of War is authorized to furnish, upon application, for use on graves in cemeteries where stone markers are not acceptable, a headstone or marker of such standard design and material as may be approved by him, within the limit of prevailing costs of the standard World War type headstone, for the grave of any deceased person for which the Secretary of War is authorized to furnish a marker or headstone: *Provided,* That the Secretary of War shall furnish the upright stone marker, authorized by section 4877 of the Revised Statutes, for cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

TRAVEL EXPENSES OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN OFFICERS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8151) to provide travel expenses of civilian officers and employees upon official change of station.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter any appropriations made available for expenses of travel of civilian officers and employees of the executive departments and establishments shall be available also for expenses of travel performed by them on transfer from one official station to another when authorized by the head of the department or establishment concerned: *Provided,* That such expenses shall not be allowed for any transfer effected for the convenience of the officer or employee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RADIO REQUIREMENTS FOR SHIPS ON GREAT LAKES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7863) to amend section 602 (e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended,

relating to a study of radio requirements for ships navigating the Great Lakes and inland waters of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 602 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (50 Stat. 197; U. S. C., 1934 ed. Supp. IV, title 47, sec. 602), is hereby amended by striking out the words "not later than December 31, 1939", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "as soon as practicable but not later than January 1, 1941".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING MARITIME COMMISSION TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN LANDS, ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 424, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to acquire certain lands at St. Petersburg, Fla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the United States Maritime Commission is hereby authorized, with funds in the construction fund of the Commission, to acquire on behalf of the United States by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, and pay all costs incident to the examination, transfer, and perfecting of title to that certain tract of land aggregating 10.05 acres, more or less, situated and being in the county of Pinellas, State of Florida, together with the structures thereon, described as follows:

Beginning at the southeast corner of lot 4, block 22, Bayboro Addition, as recorded in plat book 3, pages 51 and 52, records of Pinellas County, Fla.; thence run south along the west line of Asbury Street South to a point 277.41 feet south; thence southeast on an angle of 45° to the left a distance of 969.16 feet; thence east on an angle of 44°57' to the left a distance of 395.4 feet; thence northwest on an angle of 124°42'34" to the left a distance of 970.38 feet to the farthest southwest corner of the wharf of the port of St. Petersburg, Fla.; thence west on an angle of 55°16'26" to the left a distance of 343.85 feet to the west line of First Street South; thence north on said west line of First Street South and on an angle of 89°56' to the right a distance of 164.3 feet to the southeast corner of lot 4, block 23, said Bayboro Addition; thence west on an angle of 89°46'42" to the left and on the south line of said lot 4, block 23, and continue west to the west line of Asbury Street South a distance of 185 feet to the point of beginning, all of said tract lying and being in the city of St. Petersburg, county of Pinellas, State of Florida.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BARRING CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8150) providing for the barring of claims against the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. BURDICK. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BURDICK, Mr. O'CONNOR, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota objected.

AMENDING CROP-LOAN LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7878) to amend the crop-loan law relating to the lien imposed thereunder, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Michigan to withdraw that request so that I may make an explanation under the reservation of an objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have read the bill and report very carefully and it seems to me that the bill is really a bill for the relief of the landlord. It secures the landlord's share and lessens the security of the Government. I think

it so amends the policy with respect to these loans as to point to an entirely new policy with respect to crop loans. It is too important a bill to be taken up by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement and do not care to argue the matter other than to say that the first part of the bill just prevents the Farm Credit Administration from taking a lien on a farmer's particular crop as a whole. Just that crop that is financed with the proceeds of the loan is subject to the lien. As the law now stands his entire crop is subject to the lien. As I understand, it is the second portion of the bill to which the gentleman from Michigan objects—the elimination of the landlord's waiver of his lien. I do not ask the gentleman to withdraw his objection, but if he feels the bill should be objected to, I shall have to accede to his demand.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Possibly debate would clear up some of the objections that I have.

Mr. DOXEY. We did not have much objection in our committee. We gave this bill very thorough consideration. This bill was reported by our chairman, and I just wanted to know what was in the mind of the gentleman from Michigan so that we could clear it up, if possible, and pass this bill today.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Personally, I do not see why the landlord should not take a little chance along with the tenant on the loans which are made to capitalize his investment.

Mr. DOXEY. The principle and purpose is to enable the borrower to get the loan by putting up his interest in the crop, so that he does not have to be barred in case the landlord does not want to go along with him. It is all in the interest of the borrower. That is the simple explanation to this portion of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But I should think it would be very much to the interest of the landlord if he is relieved from having to put up his share as a part of the security for the loan.

Mr. DOXEY. It is a matter of negotiation between the borrower and the lender, of course. As the law now exists the landlord can block the sharecropper or tenant from getting any money at all from the Farm Credit Administration if he does not waive his lien. We are trying to eliminate that hardship on the tenant or sharecropper. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sure if that is the case, as the gentleman says, that the Rules Committee will be pleased to grant a rule for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOXEY. I just rose for the purpose of trying to persuade the gentleman from Michigan to not object. It is time now to loan money on the crop, and time is quite an element in this bill. The Committee on Agriculture was anxious to have it passed on the Consent Calendar if possible. Of course, I appreciate the gentleman's position. I would like to have him withdraw his request that it be passed over, but if he does not, I yield to his judgment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WOLCOTT) that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST GRADUATES OF CERTAIN LAW SCHOOLS, ETC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1610, to prevent discrimination against graduates of certain schools, and those acquiring their legal education in law offices, in the making of appointments to Government positions, the qualifications for which include legal training or legal experience.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if there is no explanation of this bill, I would ask that it go over without prejudice.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, I may say that I have read the report with interest, because I was very much interested in this bill. There is a practice that has developed over the years in connection with civil-service

examinations for lawyers and doctors. While this bill does not cover doctors, I think it should cover the medical profession as well.

Mr. McLEAN. And economists?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, anyone who is affected. I think the civil service should be open to everybody who meets the requirements and that the examination should be sufficiently difficult so that those only who are eminently qualified can pass. But there has been a system developed, unfortunately, where, as I understand it—and say this with some reservations, but I have had some exchange of letters with the Civil Service Commission in the past—where the Civil Service Commission permits considerable latitude to a department in writing the requirements of eligibility. True, the Civil Service Commission can disapprove the requirements, but it is very rare. As the result of the requirements written, the practical results are that only the graduates of certain schools, or men with certain experience, can qualify; the objective usually being—and I say this not in any harshly critical way, but from the angle of constructive criticism—to confine it to a small group. I think that all lawyers should be eligible to take civil-service examinations. I think all doctors should, and all others should.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This bill was introduced by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], who is a very careful and conservative man in his views and never introduces legislation unless he knows the need of it. This bill passed the Senate. I am somewhat familiar with the need of the legislation. It grows out of the practice which I think has resulted in discrimination against graduates of smaller colleges and schools and in favor of selected groups of large colleges. It is not to give one group an advantage over another, but to treat all alike and let it rest upon educational qualifications, without favoritism. I think the principle enunciated is fair, and the bill ought to pass.

Mr. McLEAN. What is the use of encumbering the statutes with a lot of laws that we pay no attention to? We have a law on the statute books that provides that no lawyer who has been connected with the Government service shall be allowed to practice law against Government or in the departments for 2 years after he leaves the service. We have had about six or eight bills here to exempt certain individuals from the provisions of that law. Not only do we allow them to retire from the Government service and immediately engage in practice in matters where the Government is concerned and before the departments, but they have taken with them unfinished Government matters on which they had been engaged and they are continued in Government employ and are paid annual salaries while they are at the same time practicing law and taking business against the Government. I do not see why we should encumber our statutes with a lot of laws that mean nothing and to which we are going to pass exceptions not only for schools, but for particular individuals.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Permit me to say that I agree with the gentleman, that laws ought to be enforced. I am in favor of the enforcement of all laws. But I ask the gentleman from New Jersey, Are you going to invoke the doctrine that because some laws are not enforced you will force us later to correct an injustice or discrimination which is sought to be corrected here? It will do justice to those who come from the smaller as well as the larger colleges and the gentleman's sense of fairness should prevent him from objecting to this bill.

Mr. McLEAN. I would like to know more of the background of this bill, what is behind it, and the circumstances which brought it here.

Mr. McCORMACK. They have a list of certain law schools in this country from which certain individuals will be taken.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. This bill arises out of a ruling made by an appointing officer in the Department of Agriculture. And

right here I would like to correct an impression unintentionally made by the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts. It did not arise out of any civil-service procedure, but out of a rule made by an officer in the Department of Agriculture on non-civil-service jobs. He announced that he would not consider for any legal position any lawyer who had not graduated from a school approved by the American Association of Law Schools.

The Senate passed this bill to prevent the application of that rule, taking the position, which I think is sound, that it is not where a man gets his qualifications, but has he got them, that ought to be the test as to whether he can be employed by the Government.

The Civil Service Commission, while opposed to this bill, points out that it is in line in most cases with their practice. It is true that in a few cases for specialized legal work they have required certain educational qualifications.

The purpose of the bill is to prevent any appointing officer in the Government from setting up a rule that he will not take lawyers unless they come from a particular group of law schools.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not want anything I said to be construed as a criticism of the Civil Service Commission, because I have a profound respect for the Commission, its members, and the manner of administration.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I know the gentleman has.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I do say that within the past 2 years I had a situation where a young man, a doctor, who came up the hard way, unable to attend an outstanding medical school, but came up the hard way, studied nights, served his internship; yet as a result of requirements laid down in the department, and which the Civil Service Commission approved—I suppose they collaborate with the departments as to the requirements—this man and the group he represented—and there must be many throughout the country—were unable to take the examination.

I say we want the best men in the service, but no American should be barred from taking the examination. The examination should be hard enough, severe enough, and strict enough—and it can be made so—in order that only the best qualified and most learned of those aspiring can pass the examination. In other words, opportunity of application and examination should not, in my opinion, be denied to anyone.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I agree with him 1,000 percent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman accept an amendment to include doctors also?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I have no objection to such an amendment. As a matter of fact, I have told the Commission time and time again that I did not believe they ought to announce an examination where they prohibited the substitution of experience for educational qualifications. I believe any man ought to be entitled to demonstrate his ability, regardless of whether he ever graduated from a school or college.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. I understand that the necessity for this legislation is brought about because of the arbitrary decision of some bureaucrat here in this city that he will or will not appoint a man from such and such a school. Is that true?

Mr. McCORMACK. In effect, yes.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, suggestions have been made that we include doctors, economists, social-service workers, dentists, and other groups. I think we ought to give this matter further study and have the bill passed over until we can perfect amendments to take care of these situations.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. Does not the gentleman believe it is time the House took some definite action to prevent such peremptory action on the part of bureaucrats downtown?

Mr. McLEAN. Yes; and I think, also, it is time we stopped lawyers resigning from the Government service, taking Government business with them, continuing on the pay roll, and allowing them at the same time to take cases against the Government within the time limit of the law.

I press my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I realize the gentleman's request is made from an angle that is favorable to legislation of this type and in order to enable more consideration of the bill by the Members. I personally favor the bill, but I believe it should be broadened.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I am in sympathy with the idea of broadening the provisions of this act. In this connection I merely call attention to the fact that when this bill reached the House there was an amendment offered in the House Committee on the Civil Service striking out in lines 10, 11, and 12 a provision that no discrimination should apply to anyone taking an examination because of any racial or religious group or organization affiliations. I direct attention to that particular language of the Senate draft in the hope that when the bill is revised by the House Civil Service Committee the provision may be retained as passed in the Senate, because if we are going to provide for an inability on the part of these so-called bureaucrats to set up extra-legal provisions which the Congress of the United States does not enact, I certainly claim that in keeping with the fundamental provisions of the Constitution of our country, no discrimination should apply to any citizen of this Nation seeking to enter the Government service because of racial or religious group or organization affiliations, and I hope that will be cared for when the committee revises this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN]?

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I object. I may remark that this bill was reported unanimously by the House Committee on the Civil Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICE PENSIONS ACTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7147, to amend the service-pension acts pertaining to the War with Spain, Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition to include certain continuous service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in determining the period of active service for the purpose of the act of May 1, 1926 (Public Law No. 166, 69th Cong.), the act of June 2, 1930 (Public Law No. 299, 71st Cong.), and the act of May 24, 1938 (Public Law No. 541, 75th Cong.), granting service pensions to veterans and dependants of deceased veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, continuous active service entered into during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition shall be included although part of such continuous service extended into either the Philippine Insurrection or the China Relief Expedition.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "Insurrection", strike out the word "and" and insert "or."

On page 2, after line 5, insert a new provision as follows: "Payments of benefits under the provisions of this act shall be effective the date of enactment thereof as to those persons on the rolls and as to claims pending on the date of enactment of this act. In all other cases awards of pension authorized hereunder shall be effective from date of application therefor after the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILEAGE TABLES FOR UNITED STATES ARMY AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 506, relating to mileage tables for the United States Army and other Government

agencies and to mileage allowances for persons employed in the offices of Members of House and Senate.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A GREENVILLE MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 385 establishing a Greenville Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a memorial building to commemorate the Treaty of Greene Ville at Greenville, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas Greenville, Ohio, is the site of Fort Greene Ville, where was signed the famous Treaty of Greene Ville; and

Whereas the treaty thus negotiated in 1795, between General "Mad Anthony" Wayne and the Indians and signed by President George Washington and William Henry Harrison, aide de camp to General Wayne and later President of the United States, was one of the most important events in the life of our Nation; and

Whereas Greene Ville, named after General Wayne's Revolutionary compatriot, General Nathaniel Greene, marked the headquarters from which General Wayne pressed on to victory over the Indians, caused the British to retire from Detroit and other lake points, and opened to peaceful invasion the entire territory north of the Ohio River and east of the Mississippi River, from which were formed the great States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; and

Whereas the pledge of security given by the treaty stimulated emigration to a remarkable degree and made possible the founding of such outstanding cities as Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Fort Wayne, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, and many other great cities; and

Whereas the victory is considered the most complete and most important ever gained over the Northwestern Indians during the 40 years' warfare it put to an end, and actually terminated the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Treaty of Greene Ville made possible the onrush of Americans into the great Northwest Territory, laying the foundation of the United States as a world power; and

Whereas there are now housed in the Public Library of Greenville, Ohio, hundreds of mementos and trophies of this critical period of American history which should be placed in a suitable memorial building in order to be preserved for future generations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a Commission, to be known as the Greenville Memorial Commission, and to be composed of nine Commissioners, three to be appointed by the President of the United States, three Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. Such Commission shall consider and formulate plans for designing and constructing a permanent memorial to and for designing and constructing a memorial building at Greenville, Ohio.

Sec. 2. Such Commission may, in its discretion, accept from any source, public or private, money or property to be used for the purpose of making surveys and investigations, formulating, preparing, and considering plans for the construction of such memorial, or other expenses incurred, or to be incurred, in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Sec. 3. The Commission shall report its recommendations to Congress as soon as practicable.

Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000, which shall be available to defray the necessary expenses of the Commission for the performance of their duties hereinafter prescribed. Disbursement of sums herein authorized to be appropriated shall be made upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 4, after the word "memorial", strike out "to and for designing and constructing a memorial."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELAWARE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6535, authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Delaware Tribe of Indians on account of permanent annuities under treaty provision.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 6, ORGANIC ACT OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4776, to amend section 6 of the Organic Act of Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. Convening and sessions of legislature: The Legislature of Alaska shall convene at the capitol at the city of Juneau, Alaska, on the fourth Monday in January in the year 1940 and on the fourth Monday in January in each year thereafter; but the said legislature shall not continue in session longer than 30 days in the year 1940 and in each even-numbered year thereafter and shall not continue in session longer than 60 days in the year 1941 and in each odd-numbered year thereafter unless again convened in extraordinary session by a proclamation of the Governor, which shall set forth the object thereof and give at least 15 days' notice in writing or by telegram or radiogram to each member of said legislature, and in such case shall not continue in session longer than 15 days. The Governor of Alaska is hereby authorized to convene the legislature in extraordinary session for a period not exceeding 15 days when requested to do so by the President of the United States or when any public danger or necessity may require it."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the act entitled "An act fixing the date for holding elections of a Delegate from Alaska to the House of Representatives and of members of the Legislature of Alaska; fixing the date on which the Legislature of Alaska shall hereafter meet; prescribing the personnel of the Territorial canvassing board, defining its duties, and for other purposes," approved March 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 465), is repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Legislature", strike out the balance of line 9 and all of lines 10 and 11, and lines 1 to 15 on page 2, and insert the following: "The Legislature of Alaska shall convene at the capitol at the city of Juneau, Alaska, on the fourth Monday in January in the year 1941 and on the fourth Monday in January every 2 years thereafter; but the said legislature shall not continue in session longer than 60 days in any 2 years unless again convened in extraordinary session by a proclamation of the Governor, which shall set forth the object thereof and give at least 15 days' notice in writing or by telegram or radiogram to each member of said legislature, and in such case shall not continue in session longer than 30 days. The Governor of Alaska is hereby authorized to convene the legislature in extraordinary session for a period not exceeding 30 days when requested to do so by the President of the United States, or when any public danger or necessity may require it."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO WRANGELL, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7612, for the transfer of funds to the town of Wrangell, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the judge of the district court for the first judicial division of Alaska is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the city treasurer of the incorporated town of Wrangell, Alaska, from a fund called fund "C" of said district court, the sum of \$6,092.76, heretofore paid into said fund "C" by the Diamond K Packing Co., a corporation of Wrangell, Alaska, in satisfaction of a judgment imposed upon said corporation by said court for non-payment of license tax due the United States, in approximately the same sum, and by law inuring to the benefit of said town of Wrangell.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOPTING LAWS OF STATES FOR PUNISHING WRONGFUL ACTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7018, to amend section 289 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 463) in regard to adopting laws of States for punishing wrongful acts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there some one present who can explain the effect of this bill?

Mr. CELLER. We have brought it down to February 1, to bring it up to date.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman state what part of the Federal law this applies to? Is this the section

that adopts the State codes with regard to penalties for various crimes on Federal reservations, including Indian reservations?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This merely brings this up to date, accepting the State codes?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It simply brings the present law up to date; that is correct. It extends the time for the application of the law.

Mr. CELLER. We have passed these bills almost every session.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This bill is merely a changing of the date at which the State codes are accepted?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is entirely correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I believe some of the rest of us are interested in what these bills amending the criminal code do. Will the gentleman explain the nature of the bill?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. This bill simply extends the effective date of the present law which makes applicable the provisions of the State act with respect to criminal offenses committed on a reservation which is surrounded by the State.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 289 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 463) be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 289. Whoever, within the territorial limits of any State, organized Territory, or district, but within or upon any of the places now existing or hereafter reserved or acquired, described in section 272 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 451), shall do or omit the doing of any act or thing which is not made penal by any laws of Congress, but which if committed or omitted within the jurisdiction of the State, Territory, or district in which such place is situated, by the laws thereof in force on June 1, 1939, and remaining in force at the time of the doing or omitting the doing of such act or thing, would be penal, shall be deemed guilty of a like offense and be subject to a like punishment."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out "June 1, 1939," and insert "February 1, 1940."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUNISHMENT FOR THE KILLING OR ASSAULTING OF FEDERAL OFFICERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7019, to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for the killing or assaulting of Federal officers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FADDIS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have this bill explained so we may know what it is.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The bill amends the existing law relating to the killing of certain Federal law-enforcement officers. The present act makes it a Federal offense to kill certain designated officers. Among these are United States marshals and deputy marshals and also special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The law is indefinite in that it is not quite certain whether it applies to the murder of a person who is employed to assist a United States marshal or deputy marshal or to a person who is an officer or an employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation but who may not be officially designated as a special agent of that Bureau. This bill simply expands the definition to make it certain that the law will apply to a person who is appointed by a marshal for the purpose of assisting him while, for instance, taking a prisoner to a Federal penitentiary.

Mr. FADDIS. Then it does not narrow the field any?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It expands it.

Mr. FADDIS. It does not provide any loopholes through which criminals may escape?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. No.

Mr. FADDIS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the present law take in the post-office inspectors and the employees of the Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue who are constantly investigating dangerous characters?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes. The bill does not affect those in any way.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does existing law protect them?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman will see in the report that the bill substitutes the phrase "any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation" for the phrase "special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation" in the existing law.

Mr. COCHRAN. If you are going to take care of some Federal enforcement officers, why not take care of all of them? That is what I advocate.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I may say to the gentleman that the law now applies to post-office inspectors, Secret Service operatives, and similar officers. The bill simply provides that a person who is appointed to assist a United States marshal or deputy marshal is brought within the provisions of this act.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this measure also apply to every employee or appointee of the Federal Government?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If the gentleman from Nebraska will permit me to answer, may I say to my friend from Colorado that the purpose of this proposed legislation is to bring within the protection of the Federal criminal provisions persons who are engaged by a marshal to help effectuate a particular arrest, or persons who are engaged, for instance, to help transport Federal prisoners from the place of conviction to the place of incarceration.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. It extends the act only to that extent?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is all that I know of.

Mr. KELLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what does this bill do?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It gives such persons Federal protection and makes it a Federal offense to kill persons who are engaged in aiding in the transportation, for instance, of prisoners.

Mr. KELLER. It does not put them under civil service?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; it does not apply to deputy marshals; just persons hired for the job. It also applies to persons who may be called in to help a Federal marshal effect an arrest in a particular situation.

Mr. KELLER. That is all right.

Mr. FADDIS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, would that include a chauffeur, a man driving a vehicle?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am not sure that that would be true.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It would be a question of construction. If that person were construed to be a person employed to assist a United States marshal or deputy United States marshal, it would. This bill is intended to cover into the provisions of the act individuals who are appointed or employed by a United States marshal or deputy marshal to assist in making an arrest or in dealing with prisoners.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of May 18, 1934 (ch. 299, 48 Stat. 780), as amended (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 253), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That whoever shall kill, as defined in sections 273 and 274 of the Criminal Code, any United States marshal or deputy United States marshal or person employed to assist a United States marshal or deputy United States marshal, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice,

post-office inspector, Secret Service operative, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, any employee of any United States penal or correctional institution, any officer, employee, agent, or other person in the service of the customs or of the internal revenue, any immigrant inspector or any immigration patrol inspector, any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce any act of Congress for the protection, preservation, or restoration of game and other wild birds and animals, any officer or employee of the National Park Service, any officer or employee of, or assigned to duty in, the field service of the Division of Grazing of the Department of the Interior, or any officer or employee of the Indian field service of the United States, while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be punished as provided under section 275 of the Criminal Code."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICE OF PROCESS ON THE UNITED STATES IN FORECLOSURE ACTIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7020, to amend section 2 of the act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1528), in regard to service of process on the United States in foreclosure actions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1528; U. S. C., title 28, sec. 902), be amended to read as follows:

"Service upon the United States shall be made by serving the process of the court with a copy of the bill of complaint upon the United States attorney for the district or division in which the suit has been or may be brought, or upon an assistant United States attorney or a clerical employee designated by the United States attorney in a writing filed with the clerk of the court in which suit is brought, and by sending copies of the process and bill, by registered mail, to the Attorney General of the United States at Washington, D. C. The United States shall have 60 days after service as above provided, or such further time as the court may allow, within which to appear and answer, plead, or demur."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSMISSION OF BUDGET IN YEARS IN WHICH A NEW PRESIDENT TAKES OFFICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8307, to change the date of transmission to Congress of the Budget of the United States in years in which a new President takes office.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection a moment?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I reserve it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under existing law, the President is required to transmit the Budget to Congress on the first day of each regular session thereof—section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921.

As a matter of actual practice it never is sent in until the second or third day, depending upon the delivery of the annual message. The Budget usually follows the day after the annual message is delivered.

As the law now stands, Congress meets on January 3 of each year for the regular session.

The beginning of a Presidential term is on January 20.

With the transmission of the Budget required on the first day of the regular session, January 3, and a new President taking office on January 20, the situation arises of an outgoing President preparing completely and transmitting to Congress in accordance with and as required by law, a Budget for the fiscal year which begins July 1 next following the taking of office by a new President.

Under existing law, the outgoing President would prepare and transmit the Budget which would not go into effect until the new President had been in office for approximately 6 months.

This bill would permit the outgoing President, through the Bureau of the Budget and Federal agencies to proceed with the normal preparation of the Budget and advance the work as much as possible. It would prevent the transmission of the Budget to Congress. It would permit the incoming

President to have until February 20, following his inauguration on January 20, to determine the kind of a Budget message he wished to incorporate in the Budget, and to determine the character of Budget he wished to present to Congress. A 30-day period should be sufficient to enable an incoming President to reach such conclusions and make such changes as he might desire in those items of the Budget which are not routine and which might be susceptible to changes based upon policy. The full 30 days might not be required and, in that event, the President could transmit his Budget earlier if he so desired.

A delay in the transmission of the Budget in any year until February would naturally delay the work of Congress in preparing the appropriation bills based upon that Budget; yet if the law is not changed, and the outgoing President sends in a Budget, and his successor taking office on January 20 differs with that Budget in policy or detail, and sends a modifying message to Congress remaking the Budget in essential particulars, there would be endless confusion and reconsideration with accompanying work of going over the ground again in the light of the new recommendations.

The bill would give a new President an opportunity to have something to say about the Budget for the first year of his new administration without the embarrassment of having to modify recommendations previously made by his predecessor for a period of Government during which the predecessor would not be President.

In years in which a President is inaugurated, the new Congress must be organized by the election of officers and the formation of committees. This often occupies considerable time, and the delay in the transmission of the Budget would not be entirely a loss of time under those circumstances.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I want to say to my highly distinguished friend from North Dakota, in whom I have great confidence and respect, that the prime object of this bill is to give the new or incoming Republican President an opportunity to pass upon the Budget, and I hope my Republican friend will not object.

Mr. BURDICK. In view of that promise I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, is amended to read as follows:

"The President shall transmit the Budget to Congress at each regular session thereof. The date of such transmission shall be not later than 5 days after the date of the convening of such session, except that the date of such transmission shall be not earlier than January 21, nor later than February 20, in a year in which the term of office of President of the United States begins, if the person whose term as incumbent of such office begins in such year is not the same person as the one whose term ends in such year. Each such Budget shall set forth in summary and detail:"

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND AT VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, COATESVILLE, PA.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2867, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., for right-of-way purposes, a small strip of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Coatesville, Pa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. the following-described property located at Veterans' Administration facility, Coatesville, Chester County, Pa.:

Beginning at a point, said point being marked by an iron pin and set in the southwest corner of the Veterans' Administration Reservation as now constituted, said point also being in the northerly right-of-way line of the Pennsylvania Railroad right-of-way and fifty feet distant from the center thereof; said point also being directly opposite center line station 1972 plus 28.5 of the eastern region, Eastern Pennsylvania Division, Philadelphia Division of the

Pennsylvania Railroad; thence north, no degrees fifty minutes no seconds west along the westerly boundary line of the Government Reservation, a distance of forty-two and forty one-hundredths feet to a point; thence along a curve to the left having a radius of five thousand six hundred and forty feet, a distance of six hundred and thirty-one and ninety-seven one-hundredths feet, the chord of which curve bears south seventy-four degrees thirty-four minutes six seconds east, a distance of six hundred and thirty-one and sixty-four one-hundredths feet; thence south thirty-four degrees fifty-one minutes and no seconds west along one of the boundary lines of the Government Reservation, a distance of forty-three and thirty-one one-hundredths feet to a point, said point being in the northerly right-of-way line of the Pennsylvania Railroad right-of-way and fifty feet distant from the center thereof, said point also being directly opposite center line station 1966 plus 17.55; thence along a curve to the right having a radius of five thousand six hundred and eighty feet, a distance of six hundred and five and sixty-five one-hundredths feet the chord of which curve bears north seventy-four degrees thirty-three minutes twenty seconds west, a distance of six hundred and five and thirty-six one-hundredths feet; said curve being the south boundary line of the Government Reservation and the north boundary line of the Pennsylvania Railroad right-of-way to the point of beginning, containing in all an area of five hundred and sixty-eight one-thousandths acres, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the consideration of all bills eligible for call on the calendar today.

RELIEF OF INDIANS WHO HAVE PAID TAXES ON ALLOTTED LANDS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill (H. R. 952) for the relief of Indians who have paid taxes on allotted lands for which patents in fee were issued without application by or consent of the allottees and subsequently canceled, and for the reimbursement of public subdivisions by whom judgments for such claims have been paid, was stricken from the calendar this morning, be vacated.

Mr. FADDIS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what bill is this?

Mr. CHURCH. The bill is H. R. 952.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I further reserve the right to object for the purpose of making an explanation. This is the bill which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] asked to have go over without prejudice. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] objected to that request, whereupon there were three objections to the consideration of the bill through some misunderstanding. I have spoken to the gentleman from Missouri and also to the gentleman from North Dakota and it is agreeable to them that the bill be restored to the calendar and then be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 952) be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SALE OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES LINES SHIPS TO A BELGIUM COMPANY

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the sale and transfer of eight ships belonging to the United States Lines, including the *President Harding*, to a Belgium company on an exceedingly thin mortgage is a shocking violation of the letter and spirit of the American Neutrality Act.

The United States Lines chartered the ships, worth \$4,000,000, on a bare-boat charter, without any American crew for a down payment of only \$137,000. This means that the United States Lines has a first mortgage of 97 percent in these boats. What a farce and travesty of our neutrality, when an American company can continue to own 97-percent interest in the ships.

The approval of the United States Maritime Commission of this sale and transfer of American ships to a Belgium company for operation between New York, England, France, and Belgium is an outrageous subterfuge and breach of our neutrality. This transfer is far worse than the administration's previous attempt to turn these ships over to the Panamanian flag.

The fight in the Congress centered on keeping American ships out of belligerent areas, and now an arm of the Government proposes to send ships in which American companies have a major interest into the war zone.

The minute we turn our ships over to carry arms and ammunition to belligerent nations we must expect reprisals and direct attacks from submarines and raiders off our coast.

This transfer is a reckless disregard of the intent of Congress in the Neutrality Act, which had for its main purpose keeping American ships out of the war zones and ourselves out of war. The next step will be to fly American flags over these 97 percent American-owned ships.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the Commissioner of Reclamation as to the Grand Coulee Dam. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a statement by the Geological Survey showing the stream flow during the last year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement in regard to the attitude of the American Federation of Labor on the poll tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include certain excerpts on vital material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of labor conditions in New York, and to insert a brief statement by Luigi Antonini, of the American Labor Party.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF LAND, TURTLE MOUNTAIN INDIAN AGENCY

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1036) to authorize the purchase of certain lands adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Agency in the State of North Dakota, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma, Mr. HILL, Mr. BURDICK.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 407, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. Pending that I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in my remarks certain newspaper articles to which I shall refer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the time for general debate has already been fixed by unanimous consent. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 407.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 407, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 407

Resolved, etc., That the period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the act (Public, No. 316, 73d Cong.) approved June 12, 1934, is hereby extended for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1940.

The CHAIRMAN. Under consent order of February 14 the time for general debate is fixed at 12 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, since January 11 the Committee on Ways and Means has been giving continuous and careful consideration to House Joint Resolution 407, a resolution to extend the Trade Agreements Act, which is now before the House for consideration. That measure was first enacted in June of 1934, to be effective for a period of 3 years. In 1937 it was extended for an additional 3-year period, which will expire on June 12, 1940. At the time of its original enactment, and even, to some extent, upon the occasion of its extension in 1937, we were proceeding principally upon the basis of a strong hope and conviction that the reciprocal-trade program was the best means of curing the multitude of evils which had arisen under the Hawley-Smoot Act. We then dealt with hopes and beliefs; we now deal with concrete realities and factual evidence.

The Trade Agreements Act has been in operation almost 6 years, and there need be no further conjecture regarding its merits. There are sufficient facts before us to convince anyone who will give them unbiased and nonpartisan consideration of the virtues and success of the program. Very few public statutes or issues in the entire history of our Nation have been subjected to such widespread and critical examination. Through every channel of publication, the facts concerning this program have been placed before the American people, and its merits have been discussed and argued by almost every commentator on public affairs.

NEEDS FOR THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE PROGRAM

At the time of its enactment the Trade Agreements Act was not only the choice of all of the possible courses of action with respect to the tariff, but it was the only one having the elements necessary to success. Its adoption was a dire necessity if we were to stem the tide of calamity which was sweeping in upon us.

The Hawley-Smoot Tariff was enacted in June of 1930. However, the Congress began its consideration at a special session in April of 1929, called, ostensibly, for the purpose of a limited revision of the tariff to aid agriculture. It immediately became apparent that it was not to be a limited revision but an old-fashioned, logrolling tariff in the traditional Republican manner. Even Mark Sullivan describes this procedure as the typical Republican way. Not only this Nation, but the whole world saw what was coming. There immediately flocked to Washington a multitude of emissaries from the organized special interests. The representatives of each industry or interest had their pet object which must be protected at all costs. Logrolling, horse trading, and back scratching flourished as the contending factions maneuvered for position.

The best possible government is one whose primary consideration is the best interest and general welfare of its

people as a whole. However, it is notorious that, in the consideration of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, as in other Republican tariff legislation, an absolutely contrary course was followed. No group or interest, not ably represented at that grab fest, was given more than secondary or passing consideration, and, judged by their actions, nothing could have been further from the minds of its sponsors than the general welfare of all the American people. Some of the most favored of the benefit grabbers actually attended the executive session of the Committee on Ways and Means, so I am reliably informed, while the Democratic members of the committee were excluded (read Hull's testimony). The experts and clerks of other favored groups were given desks in the committee rooms and became a part of the committee staff.

The connection between tariff benefits and service to the Republican Party was never stronger. Those who had responded most liberally when the campaign hat was passed had the loudest and most effective voices in the distribution of the pie.

Mr. Chairman, Hon. Cordell Hull, now Secretary of State, at that time was the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He was not even permitted to sit in when the bill was under consideration in executive session. He was unable to find out what was in the bill until it had been already acted upon by the Republican members of the committee. That was the consideration given the minority members in the consideration of the Smoot-Hawley bill.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the bill in the committee, as I recall, it was impossible except for Republican members of the committee to offer amendments.

Mr. DOUGHTON. They brought in a special rule to permit no amendments except those offered by the majority members of the committee. Still we hear our friends of the minority talk about star-chamber proceedings. That is mentioned in the minority report. Of all people who should never talk about secret or star-chamber proceedings, or steam-roller processes, our minority friends are the last that should ever utter a word in that regard.

Of the 10,681 lines in the Hawley-Smoot bill, only 82 were considered in the House. Of the 727 paragraphs included in the first and second sections of the bill, only 6 of them were read and considered. Of the 183 sections contained in the bill, only a small fraction of one of the sections was read and considered. There were only 4 pages of the 434 pages of the bill given any consideration. Of this procedure, Ragon, of Arkansas, a former member of the Ways and Means Committee, said:

As a fitting climax to this legislative horseplay which characterized the conduct of this bill through its consideration by the House, the Clerk read, as a part of the meager consideration of this bill, paragraph 2 * * *

A paragraph dealing with the chemical schedule.

During the formulation and enactment of the Hawley-Smoot legislation storm warnings were flying from every direction. More than a thousand leading economists predicted with prophetic accuracy the results which followed. It was pointed out that the only possible fruit of such evilly conceived and ill-considered legislation would be a disastrous effect upon our trade relations with foreign nations and, consequently, upon our own economy. The spokesmen of the Democratic Party and many leaders among the Republicans protested with all of the vigor at their command.

Our Republican friends contended with all the fervor of their souls that the Smoot-Hawley Act had nothing whatever to do with the depression of 1930 and afterward.

For instance, Mr. William Allen White, of Emporia, Kans., and editor of the Emporia Gazette, states:

One of the things that brought about the depression was the Smoot-Hawley bill. The Gazette said so at the top of its lungs before the Smoot-Hawley law was finally formulated, while it was passing, and after it had become a law. That tariff was an offense against economic stability not only in the United States but all over the world.

I have some testimony here by the minority leader, bearing on that same subject. Here is what the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN] said as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

From 1930 on, world conditions continued to get progressively worse. No one recognized this fact more clearly than President Hoover and the Republican Members of the Congress. They saw that these world-trade barriers which restricted the intelligent flow of goods were causing the depression.

What produced those barriers but the Smoot-Hawley Act?

Messrs. Garver and Hansen, two of the leading economists of the country, spoke concerning this matter, as follows:

The Tariff Act of 1930, agitated in 1928—

That is when the country began to get alarmed—

introduced in Congress in 1929 at the height of prosperity, and passed before the depression had become serious, intensified international difficulties. It gave the signal for the collapse of the tariff truce which had been prepared in Europe, and led to tariff retaliations in many countries.

That is what these disinterested authorities and able economists said on this subject:

They further stated:

Under the impact of the depression, the fall in prices, and the break-down of the international gold standard, tariffs almost everywhere were raised and other forms of trade restrictions were adopted, including rigid limitation of imports by means of fixed quotas and vigorous governmental control over foreign exchange.

I might read also for the edification of my brethren of the minority what the Washington Daily News of Monday, June 16, 1930, had to say editorially in this regard:

No one can explain away the disastrous effects of this suicidal legislation on American prosperity.

Here are the facts as recorded on just 1 day: On the day the bill passed Wall Street responded with a market drop which dragged several standard stocks even lower than in the November crash.

On the day the bill passed there was a general fall in commodity prices, bringing some to new low levels for the year.

On the day the bill passed all grain prices fell to new levels for the season—wheat went to the lowest price in a year, oats the lowest in 8 years, rye the lowest in 30 years.

On the day the bill passed the price of cotton declined to the lowest level in more than 3 years.

Our friends disclaim and deny any responsibility whatsoever for the depression, so far as the Smoot-Hawley Act is concerned. It is characteristic of our friends to always claim credit when the country is prosperous and conditions are favorable, but when the reverse is the case, they deny responsibility.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Reminiscent of the passage of the bill and the figures quoted by the gentleman with reference to the fall on the stock market and agricultural prices, I recall quite vividly that the last argument made in favor of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill was by our friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER], and his last words were that the sunshine of prosperity is now about to burst upon our great country in the passage of this great bill. I recall that I made the remark next day that the sunshine burst the wrong way, and it kept on bursting the wrong way continuously thereafter.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That was about the time that Mr. Hoover said that Republican policies would abolish poverty and that two cars would be in every garage and every pot would be filled with good fat chickens. That was about the same time as the remarks of the gentleman from New York, Dr. CROWTHER.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not now. I do not have time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Quoting further from the News:

On the day the bill passed European dispatches reported that the copper interests of Great Britain, Belgium, and Germany had agreed to retaliate by withdrawing large orders in the United States for copper and nonferrous metals, whereupon the American Copper Exporters' Association frantically cut prices.

On the day the bill passed, the Mexican Government officially announced it would erect retaliatory duties, which follows similar retaliation against us by Canada and others.

Not only Mexico but also other nations announced retaliatory duties, which followed similar action by Canada and other nations.

On the day the bill passed, the United States Department of Commerce announced that American exports dropped in May to the lowest point in the last 6 years.

When the Smoot-Hawley Act was under consideration our Republican friends were so sure that it was a panacea for all our ills and would cure all of our economic difficulties that Senator Watson, of Indiana, in the Senate made this very definite statement:

It is quite true that we are in the midst of a financial depression produced by manifest causes that I shall not here discuss and which do not pertain to this subject, but I here and now predict, and I ask my fellow Senators to recall this prediction in the days to come, that if this bill is passed this Nation will be on the upgrade financially, economically, and commercially within 30 days, and that within a year from this time we shall have regained the peak of prosperity and the position we lost last October, and shall again resume our position as the first and foremost of all the people of history in all the essential elements of individual and national greatness.

EFFECTS OF THE HAWLEY-SMOOT ACT

The storm warnings were unheeded, the counsel of the economists ignored, and the protests were lightly turned aside. The effects of the legislation were even more calamitous than its critics had predicted.

Agriculture, the already desperate plight of which had served as the excuse for the Grundy orgy, sank to unbelievably lower depths. The farm cash income of the United States dropped down from 11.2 billions of dollars in 1929 to 4.7 billions in 1932. By 1932, farmers were getting 30 cents a bushel for their wheat, notwithstanding the wheat tariff of 42 cents a bushel. They were getting only 10 to 20 cents a bushel for corn, even though the corn tariff was 25 cents a bushel. In Kansas and other States corn was being used for fuel. They were getting only 15 or 16 cents a pound for their butterfat, although the tariff on butter was 14 cents a pound. They were getting only 9 cents a pound for their wool, even though the wool tariff was 24 cents a pound. Cotton was selling for about 5 cents a pound. Millions of farmers lost their homes.

In retaliation against the excessive rates provided, other countries set up barriers equal to or greater than our own. The result was a complete deadlock, resulting in a gradually increasing paralysis of international trade and commerce. Our sales to other nations fell from over 5 billion dollars in 1929 to a little more than 1½ billions in 1932. The ruinous effects of the closing of export outlets for the great surplus-producing divisions of both agriculture and industry rapidly permeated every branch of our economic life. The reduced purchasing power of their employees and owners was immediately reflected in the consumption of articles produced for domestic use. This vicious cycle grew in intensity until American business, industry, and agriculture found themselves in the midst of utter ruin.

It was a particularly ironic justice that caused those groups and interests, who had clamored for and secured special protection under the Hawley-Smoot Act, to suffer from its iniquitous effects just as did their fellow citizens who had not received favored treatment. They had pulled the house down on themselves.

DEMOCRATIC ACTION TO SAVE THE NATION FROM "GRUNDYISM"

The present administration met the problem squarely with bold and vigorous action. Many purely domestic measures were taken to restore employment, relieve suffering and distress, rebuild prices, increase wages and values, save our farms and homes from mortgage foreclosures, rescue our factories and business houses from bankruptcy, make our banks and financial institutions safe depositories of the people's money, and to restore transportation and to improve all phases of our national economic life.

It was evident, however, that such action alone could not insure a full and stable prosperity unless our foreign trade could be revived. The only way this could be achieved was to remove the strangling shackles which the Hawley-Smoot tariff had wound about our commerce with other nations. Intelligent observers pointed out that unless we could see our national economy as a whole and could view national prosperity as a unit, we could never hope to place this Nation upon a permanently secure economic basis.

The basic philosophy which activated the Congress in the adoption of the Trade Agreements Act was founded in a realization that exports and imports are interdependent, and that nations, like individuals, cannot sell unless they buy. We knew that it would prove impossible to persuade other nations to modify their trade restrictions toward us, imposed to counteract the restrictions which we had raised against them, unless we stood ready to adjust our own trade barriers and correct our own mistakes. With international economic relationships so filled with swiftly changing complexities in which other governments have the means of speedy action, we believed it necessary for the legislative and executive branches of our Government to cooperate in providing the proper means of meeting these emergencies with action equally swift.

By the Reciprocal Trade Act the Congress placed in the hands of the Executive the authority and responsibility of administering this program, after first defining the policy to be followed, the limitations and restraints beyond which the powers granted do not extend, and the methods by which the purposes of the act are to be carried out. We believed and still believe, and the facts fully support our contention, that the program adopted was the best way to deal with the vexatious problem; and that it supplies the safest, surest, simplest, and only practical method of rebuilding our foreign trade on a secure basis.

SAFEGUARDS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

The Congress exercised the utmost caution, consistent with the speed and efficacy necessary to the success of the program, by surrounding the administration of the Trade Agreements Act with every possible safeguard. Under the provisions of the statute no agreement can be entered into until after due public notice shall have been given and all interested persons have had an opportunity to be heard and to present their views.

Moreover, section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act provides that before concluding any agreement "the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate."

Pursuant to this provision an interdepartmental organization has been established on which five agencies are regularly represented, namely, the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, and Treasury, and the United States Tariff Commission. Through this organization the agencies mentioned participate in the formulation of every detail of the trade agreements and no agreement has been entered into which has not been fully concurred in by them. In addition, a number of other departments and agencies are consulted with respect to special questions coming within their field and their information and views have been brought to bear upon the questions presented.

I am assured by the heads of the departments concerned that this organization and this procedure will be fully maintained with respect to any action taken under this authority in the future, not only as regards the question of concluding particular agreements but as regards the joint participation in the formulation of their terms down to the minutest detail.

This procedure and administration is in accordance with the intention of Congress when the existing statute was enacted. I desire to state that I urge the renewal of this act with that fact in mind.

In other words the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the United States Tariff Commission all cooperated in working out and negotiating these trade agreements. I was informed today by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce as well as the Department of State that they have all cooperated 100 percent and that they have worked unitedly, that there has been no disagreement, that they have been in entire accord as to all of these agreements which have been negotiated. Is not this sufficient assurance that the purposes of the bill have been carried out, and likewise assurance that proper and necessary safeguards were thrown about the program?

There is also an Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee, made up of representatives of the departments and agencies of the Government, which directs all necessary studies, reviews the reports and recommendations of its subcommittees, and approves all details of the agreements subject to final approval by the Secretary of State and the President. Each agreement is further protected by an escape clause.

I am reliably informed that not only are the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and the Tariff Commission cooperating, but that also they call in the heads of other Departments and Bureaus and get advice from them, and secure the best information possible before these agreements are concurred in. Oh, the minority report says that notwithstanding they give hearings to all interested parties, hearings should be granted after the agreements are negotiated, after they are prepared and perfected. Think how perfectly ridiculous such a proposition is. It is just like saying that they should give hearings on a tariff bill after the committee has brought in its recommendation. They know that such a thing was never done. They know that such a policy would vitiate any program adopted. They know that no one could ever do anything like that. That is so asinine and so absolutely ridiculous that I am surprised that the minority representatives should suggest it. There would never be any end to negotiations.

Each agreement is further protected by an escape clause. I have a letter here from Secretary Hull on that subject amplifying his position and will place that in the RECORD:

FEBRUARY 8, 1940.

The Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Replying to your inquiry relative to the escape or safeguarding clauses included in trade agreements and the policy of the Executive branch of the Government in putting them into operation, with special reference to the trade agreement with Venezuela, I would say that, in accordance with the general policy of providing flexibility in order to safeguard the interests of our domestic producers, an escape or safeguarding clause in unusually broad terms was included in the trade agreement with Venezuela. This clause permits remedial action whenever—to use the language of the agreement—"special circumstances" render it necessary or advisable to do so. The clause would permit such action with respect to petroleum or any other product included in the agreement.

I scarcely need to assure you that the operation of the trade agreements is given constant and careful supervision in order that remedial action may be taken whenever it appears that the producer of any product might be materially injured. Nor is it necessary to add that this statement applies to the concessions granted on petroleum and other products included in the Venezuelan agreement.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Secretary Hull definitely and plainly states that, through the escape clause, if any mistakes are made, the injured party may have a hearing to show wherein he is injured. Through this escape clause any injurious effect of the trade agreements is remedied.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina to the fact that the late President

McKinley, despite the efforts of our Republican friends to place a different construction upon what he said in the last speech he made before he was unfortunately assassinated, made the strongest appeal for reciprocal-trade agreements that I have ever heard expressed by anyone. In fact, his suggestions were nearly along the lines of the present law.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Absolutely. You could lay the statement of President McKinley alongside the words of Secretary Hull and hardly distinguish between them.

Here is what President McKinley said in his last speech:

We have a vast and intricate business, built up through years of toil and struggle, in which every part of the country has its stake, which will not permit of either neglect or of undue selfishness. No narrow, sordid policy will subserve it. The greatest skill and wisdom on the part of the manufacturers and producers will be required to hold and increase it. Our industrial enterprises, which have grown to such great proportions, affect the homes and occupations of the people and the welfare of the country. Our capacity to produce has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of our markets requires our urgent and immediate attention. Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more. In these times of marvelous business energy and gain we ought to be looking to the future, strengthening the weak places in our industrial and commercial systems, that we may be ready for any storm or strain.

By sensible trade arrangements, which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and production, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?

Had I not known by whom that statement was made I would have thought it came from Secretary Hull on the subject of reciprocity.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I make another inquiry? Has my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, any observations to make on the unfortunate situation that arose in the committee where the Republican members undertook to make this a political issue?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It was very unfortunate that a great economic question like this should be made a political issue; but from the very beginning of our hearings, at every turn, every day, every opportunity, it was perfectly manifest they were making political capital out of this question.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will not the gentleman admit that the tariff has been a political issue in this country from the very foundation of our Government?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; but I will not admit it should be. Of course, it is an issue upon which the Republican Party has depended for its life and vitality. If you were to take that issue from it, I do not know on what source they would rely for campaign funds, and without campaign funds I do not know where it would be. It gives them a source of revenue to conduct their campaigns, and that is the cause of the desperate opposition to this legislation.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Does not the gentleman know his own party endorsed the Republican Party policy with reference to the protective tariff, and does not the gentleman know every man on the Democratic side of the Committee on Ways and Means—

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not yield for a speech from the gentleman. I do not know that the Democratic Party has ever taken that position, and I hope it will never endorse

everything that the Republican Party stands for in the way of a tariff. I would feel like quitting the Democratic Party if it committed a sin of that kind.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEARHART. I hope the Democratic Party never does fall as low as the gentleman pointed out, but likewise the gentleman rose to great heights when he referred to President McKinley. But whether the question of the tariff is a political one or not, I want the gentleman to know exactly what President McKinley did stand for, and with his permission may I read at this moment about three lines from what the former President had to say on this subject?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I cannot yield for a stump speech. The gentleman can use his own time.

Mr. GEARHART. I want to read a line or two.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I cannot yield. The gentleman can do that in his own time.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman quoted what President McKinley said.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not yield to the gentleman. The gentleman took more time to make stump speeches in committee than any other member. I decline to yield at this time for a political stump speech.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The statement to which the gentleman from California refers is in the minority report, which is available to all Members.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Of course it is there, and it will be distorted in every possible way in order to make capital out of it.

RESULTS OF THE PROGRAM

By inaugurating the trade-agreements program, under our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, we took a position of leadership in a movement to reverse the destructive trends of trade-destroying impediments and to open the way for a healthy expansion of mutually beneficial trade between our country and the rest of the world. Trade agreements have been concluded with 21 nations, including such important commercial countries as the United Kingdom and Canada, our 2 best customers. These agreements include 8 with European countries: namely Belgium, Sweden, the Netherlands, Switzerland, France, Finland, the United Kingdom, and Czechoslovakia, which has been terminated. One agreement has been concluded with Turkey, a near-eastern country, and, in the Western Hemisphere, the original agreement with Canada, effective on January 1, 1936, has been superseded by a new agreement, effective on January 1, 1939. Eleven agreements have been concluded with the following American republics: Cuba, Haiti, Brazil, Honduras, Colombia, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ecuador, and Venezuela. One agreement, that with Cuba, became effective in 1934, 3 in 1935, 10 in 1936, 2 in 1937, 2 in 1938, and 3 in 1939.

Let us take notice of the effect of the reciprocal-trade agreements. The way to judge anything is by its effect, not what its opponents or proponents may say about it.

In 1929, our exports to those countries with which we now have trade agreements aggregated about \$3,000,000,000. By 1933, sales to these countries had sunk to less than \$1,000,000,000. In 1938, they had risen again to more than \$2,000,000,000. Trade with these countries constitutes about 60 percent of our total foreign trade.

In the trade agreements thus far concluded with 21 countries, the foreign governments concerned have lowered their trade barriers on a wide range of American farm and factory products. The concessions obtained by the United States include duty reductions, enlarged quotas, and other mitigations of restrictive measures, as well as the binding of existing duties or free entry, on literally hundreds of items which enter into our export trade. Opponents of a liberal trade policy try to tell us that the concessions which we have ob-

tained are of no benefit while those which we have granted are injurious.

They produced no evidence in support of the contention. That is the only statement that was made, but it is not supported by the facts. When you compare our trade with the countries with which we have negotiated trade agreements, with those countries with which we have no trade agreements, it will be shown conclusively the benefits that have flown from the enactment of these agreements.

Taking the years 1934 and 1935 as substantially a pre-agreement period, since only one agreement was in effect for the entire year of 1935, exports from the United States averaged two and two-tenths billion dollars. During the 2-year period 1937 and 1938, with 17 agreements in effect for most of the time, exports had increased to an average of three and two-tenths billion dollars.

That is an increase of \$1,000,000,000 over the period before the agreements were entered into. We do not make exaggerated claims, or claims that cannot be supported by the facts.

While no claim is made that this entire trade increase was due to the advantages for American exports obtained by the United States in trade agreements, it is significant that during the period 1937-38, exports from the United States to countries with which reciprocal-trade agreements were in operation averaged 61.2 percent greater than during the 1934-35 period. Over the same periods, our exports to non-trade-agreement countries averaged only 37.9 percent greater.

INCREASED IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

A comparison of the average imports and exports with respect to both the trade-agreement and nonagreement countries for the years 1934 and 1935, as against those for the years 1937 and 1938, show the following results: For 1934-35, the yearly average of exports to the trade-agreement countries was \$760,000,000. For 1937-38, this figure had risen to one billion two hundred and twenty-five millions, an increase of four hundred and sixty-five millions, or 61 percent. At the same time, our average imports from these same countries increased from \$794,000,000 to 1934-35 to one billion seventy-four millions in 1937-38, an increase of two hundred and eighty millions or only 35 percent, as compared with the 61-percent increase in exports. This shows we were not out-traded in these agreements.

Using a like comparison regarding our trade with non-agreement countries, exports increased from one billion four hundred and forty-eight millions to one billion nine hundred and ninety-seven millions, an increase of five hundred and forty-nine millions, or 38 percent as compared to the 61-percent increase in the case of the trade-agreement countries. On the same basis, imports from the nonagreement countries increased from one billion fifty-seven millions to one billion four hundred and forty-eight millions, an increase of three hundred and ninety-one millions, or 37 percent.

Thus, in the case of the trade-agreement countries, exports have increased 61 percent while imports have increased 35 percent; while in the case of the nonagreement countries, imports and exports have increased in almost exactly the same proportion.

In this respect, Roger Babson, noted statistician, in an article appearing last Monday in the Washington Post, states:

This, in a nutshell tells the effectiveness of the program, its aid to jobs and industry.

And, in closing his article, he further states:

As statistician, I believe that the Hull trade pacts should be backed to the limit by every straight-thinking, unselfish, and honest American.

It is important to note not only that exports from the United States to the trade-agreements countries have gained relatively more than exports to non-trade-agreement countries, but also that the trade-agreement countries have generally increased their purchases of American products more than they have increased their purchases of the products of other countries. For example, in 1937 and 1938, Belgian imports for consumption from the United States were 81 percent

and 100 percent, respectively, above imports during the pre-agreement year, 1934, while Belgian imports from all other countries were only 44 percent and 14 percent greater. In the 3 years 1936-38 of the first agreement with Canada, that country's imports from the United States averaged 42 percent greater than in 1934-35 as compared with an average gain of 22 percent in Canadian imports from countries other than the United States between the same periods.

BENEFITS TO AGRICULTURE

The benefits which American agriculture has derived from the operation of the trade-agreements program are substantial. The volume of agricultural commodities imported from trade-agreement countries has not increased to any greater degree than the volume of such imports from nonagreement countries. On the other hand, farm exports to the trade-agreement countries have increased 15 percent from 1935-36 to 1938-39, while exports to nonagreement countries have actually decreased 19 percent.

Valuable and substantial concessions have been secured from many foreign countries regarding our basic farm products such as corn, hogs, wheat, fruits, tobacco, lard, and many other items. Under this treatment, farm income rose from four and seven-tenths billions of dollars in 1932 to seven and six-tenths billions in 1938.

The increased consuming power of the industrial worker and city dweller, due to the beneficial effects of this program, has aided substantially in the improvement of the farmer's domestic market. In addition, allowing for the changes in the cost of living to the farmer, the farm income of 1938 represented at least 40 percent more purchasing power than such income for 1932.

These are substantial, concrete facts and not opinions, about which there can be no controversy. They stand as an insurmountable wall to those critics of the program who would have us abandon it and revert once more to particular protection of the special interest.

There was no evidence of any direct or serious injury. Those opposed to the program based their opposition on fear of what might occur. We vigorously contend that even if some slight direct injury has been sustained, it is more than compensated for by generally improved business throughout the country.

Even if some slight temporary hardship does result to some particular industry or minor group or interest, it is apparent that, in the long run, benefits will flow to every citizen through the improved national economy and general welfare of the country. We are not here dealing with local legislation which is aimed solely to the benefit of any section or group. Here we have national legislation in its broadest sense, with the welfare of the whole United States as its supreme goal.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION CLAUSE

I want to comment briefly upon the policy of equal treatment. Now, we have paid our Republican friends a great compliment by adopting the most-favored-nation policy from them. In some ways they do not seem to appreciate this compliment.

The increases in our exports to trade-agreement countries occurred not only because we obtained from such countries valuable tariff reductions and important mitigations of other restrictive measures but also because, through trade agreements, they have given us a guaranty of equal treatment. These assurances of nondiscrimination against our goods were secured through the application of the unconditional most-favored-nation principle.

For example, in the agreement with Canada, reductions due to a most-favored-nation treatment were obtained on some 600 items, covering \$112,000,000, including a long list of grains and their products, iron and steel manufactures, and heavy machinery.

There has been a good deal said to the effect that countries with which we have trade agreements continue to discriminate against us. No evidence was presented to prove the statements. A list of countries was presented by one wit-

ness, but I was interested to note that the countries had not concluded trade agreements under the present act. Through trade agreements we have an effective instrument for maintaining a nondiscriminatory principle. We have not had an effective instrument outside of trade agreements.

Obviously, when we demand and receive nondiscriminatory treatment from other countries, we must be willing to extend similar treatment to them. It is necessary insurance against one of the most injurious obstructions to trade to which our exports are exposed. Hence the Congress, in passing the Trade Agreements Act, wisely decided to continue nondiscriminatory treatment as the basis of our commercial policy. Accordingly the unconditional most-favored-nation principle—the only effective means of insuring nondiscriminatory treatment for exports—which has been employed in this country since 1923, has been embodied in our trade agreements.

We have generalized the tariff adjustments made in individual trade agreements to all countries which have been found to accord us substantially nondiscriminatory treatment. We have refused such generalization to countries which in turn refuse us such treatment. In this manner our most-favored-nation policy has been a means not only of improving our trade with the trade-agreement countries, but also a valuable instrument for safeguarding our trade position in other countries. The records of our recent hearings show that the advantages to us under this principle have been 8 or 9 to 1. That certainly, by no stretch of the imagination, can be considered a Santa Claus policy. This policy is followed because it is good business.

Mr. BUCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman has noted in the minority report the statement that the exports were already on the increase at the time the trade-treaty program began. Is it not a fact that as a result of the Republican high-tariff, depression-creating policy our exports had reached such a low level in 1932 that any increase would have been a large gain?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why, of course. There is no question about that. It had reached a death level.

Mr. BUCK. Is it not a fact that actually exports increased by \$64,000,000 in 1933 over 1932 and by \$522,000,000 in 1934 over 1933; so that there was a tremendous increase after the trade-agreement program went into effect?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. If you do not manipulate the figures and state the facts just as they are, there is no question about that.

Mr. BUCK. In 1935 the exports were \$150,000,000 greater than in 1934; in 1936, \$323,000,000 above 1934; in 1937, \$1,216,000,000 above 1934, an average of \$739,000,000 every year from 1934 through to the year 1939.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I regret I do not have the time to yield now. I might yield for a brief question. I want to be fair.

Mr. MOTT. Suppose I ask a question, then. What was the value of our exports last year?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does the gentleman mean our exports for 1939 to non-trade-agreement countries?

Mr. MOTT. No; the total amount, our total exports.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know whether I have that figure right here. I can get it and put it in the Record; my recollection is our exports were \$3,177,000,000.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Has any expert opinion been vouchsafed as to what percentage of these increases is attributable to our reciprocal-trade agreements?

Mr. DOUGHTON. There might be a difference of opinion about that, but when we show that the increase to countries with which we have the agreements is much larger than the increase to the countries with which we do not have trade agreements, it is a logical and reasonable conclusion that the

greater increase to the countries with which we do have agreements is attributable to the agreements.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Particularly in view of the fact that there is no other chief reason for the increase?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know of any other. I do not believe you can study the facts and reach any other reasonable conclusion.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will yield, I believe I have the figures here.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman does not have the figures, I may say that I have the figures for the first 11 months of 1939.

Mr. COOPER. The total exports of the United States for 1939 were \$3,136,000,000, or an increase of 42 percent over the pre-trade-agreement years 1934 and 1935.

Mr. MOTT. They increased only a fraction of a percent over 1929?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did not yield to the gentleman to make a stump speech. I do not have the time. The gentleman will get time from his side to make his speech.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman misunderstands; I was asking a question. I say that is an increase of only a fraction of 1 percent over the exports for 1929.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman can make his own calculation.

Mr. MOTT. I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman will not dispute the fact that there has been an increase over—

Mr. MOTT. Over 1929? I do dispute it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Since the trade agreements over the prior years.

Mr. MOTT. Over the depression years of 1931 and 1932, certainly, but not over the year 1929, when there was no depression. The figures show that our exports now are no greater than they were then.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman does not deny the fact that there has been a decided improvement over the years when the Hawley-Smoot Act was in effect. There is no denial. The facts will not support a denial.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read a telegram that should have gone in the hearings but was not received until after the hearings were closed. This is from Clarence Poe, editor of the Progressive Farmer and Southern Ruralist, an agricultural paper that has as wide a circulation as any farm paper in the United States. He is not a politician, and he is not trying to make any political capital of this or to deceive anyone. He has made as thorough and careful a study of this subject from the standpoint of the interest of agriculture as any man, perhaps, in the entire country.

The telegram reads as follows:

Hon. R. L. DOUGHTON, RALEIGH, N. C., February 15, 1940.
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means:

I earnestly hope you and your committee will do everything in your power to secure an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I believe present world conditions make it imperative that America follow this procedure in order to restore international trade and that the labors of a man so able, patriotic, and well informed as Cordell Hull will result in gains to American agriculture far offsetting some incidental losses. As a past master of the North Carolina State Grange I especially regret what I believe the mistaken attitude of Mr. TABER on this issue. Since I find it impossible to reach Washington at this time I shall be glad if you will read to your committee this statement, which am confident is for the best interests of the 950,000 southern farmers who read our magazine.

CLARENCE POE,
President and Editor, Progressive Farmer and Southern Ruralist.

Also a telegram from Mr. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 18, 1940.
Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Washington, D. C.:

The last American Farm Bureau Federation convention, representing farmers in 39 States, endorsed without a dissenting vote continuance of reciprocal-trade agreements. All agreements to be approved by Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Agriculture. We respectfully urge your support of House Joint Resolution 407.

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

LXXXVI—104

The benefits which American agriculture have derived from the operation of the American trade-agreement program are substantial. I am trying to give the gentleman some information about the effect on agriculture now. The volume of agricultural commodities imported from countries with which we have negotiated trade agreements has not increased to any greater degree than the volume of such imports from nonagreement countries, which are affected only by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. On the other hand, farm exports to trade-agreement countries have increased 15 percent from 1935-36 to 1938-39, while exports to non-trade-agreement countries have actually decreased 19 percent. In other words, we have increased our exports of farm commodities to countries with which we have had trade agreements and have lost in exports to countries with which we have not had trade agreements. I am sure this cannot be challenged.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. Does that include the Canadian treaty or is that the general figure?

Mr. DOUGHTON. This has reference to all the treaties with respect to farm commodities.

Valuable and substantial concessions have been secured from many foreign countries regarding our basic farm products, such as corn. We have an exportable surplus of corn. We have secured concessions on corn, hogs, wheat, fruit, tobacco, lard, and many other items for which we must have an export market if we are to secure anything like living prices for these farm commodities. Cattle is about the only farm commodity that is above parity. How much further below parity would these farm commodities be were it not for our export trade which has been vitally and effectively stimulated by these trade agreements? Under this treatment farm income rose from \$4,700,000,000 in 1932 to \$7,600,000,000 in 1938.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will yield for a question to my colleague and friend on the committee. I do not yield for any statistics, because you can prove or disprove anything by statistics if they are manipulated.

When our exports of industrial commodities are increased or stimulated, that gives better prices for farm commodities at home, because the more people who work in industries, whether for domestic consumption or for exports, that provides a better market for the consumption of farm commodities.

There was no evidence of any direct or any serious injury to any agricultural interests.

Those who oppose the program base their opposition on fear of what might happen. Of course, you could have fears about any subject and never move in any direction. If we are always looking for a ghost we would never make any progress, because in any kind of legislation there is more or less risk or uncertainty and the success of any program can only be determined by its administration and its effects or results.

We seriously contend that even if any slight or indirect injury has been sustained, this is more than compensated by the general improved conditions throughout the country brought about by the Trade Agreements Act. More than that, let me repeat that in the administration of this law, the Secretary of State, whose judgment, ability, experience, and patriotism cannot be questioned, has assured us that every possible safeguard is thrown around the domestic producer in order to protect him from any serious injury under the escape clause provided in these agreements, and in case injury is shown, prompt and effective action will be taken as stated in Secretary Hull's letter which I have already placed in the RECORD, in order to remove the danger of any injury that might come to any domestic industry. I do not know what more could be expected.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman has on at least two occasions mentioned the escape clause with which we are all familiar.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. It is a fact, is it not, that it has not been used at any time?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know that there has been any special necessity for it being used, because no case of injury has been shown, but we are assured it will be used if necessary or if there is any occasion for it. I cannot yield for a speech to my friend, who is an able member of our committee, because I want to conclude my remarks, but I will yield for a question.

Mr. CARLSON. Does not the gentleman think that the zinc producers of the United States produced a pretty good case of injury?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not think so, because of the fact it was shown, I think, by conclusive evidence they were in a very, very prosperous condition. So I do not see how any great injury can occur to an industry when it is very prosperous. Perhaps they expect too much.

Here is something that ought to be of interest to the American people. They are intelligent and they are following these questions carefully. No question has been more thoroughly debated nor is better understood by the people than the question of trade agreements. Dr. George Gallup recently conducted a poll, shown in the Washington Post, and that poll shows that 71 percent of the people of the United States favor the reciprocal-tariff program. The poll further shows that the ratio or percentage of Republicans and Democrats that favor this program are about the same.

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. SANDAGER. What percentage of the people had no knowledge of the trade agreements?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, if the gentleman wants to question the knowledge of the people of the United States, he can do it. I would not want to do that. I do not think the gentleman can afford to do that, and I think the gentleman would want to take that out of the RECORD—any statement to the effect that our people are not intelligent. Seventy-one percent are for the reciprocal-trade program, the poll shows. Then there was a nonpartisan poll taken by the Economic Policy Committee, composed of outstanding economists from various universities. They polled the leading economists of the Nation regarding their reaction to the reciprocal-trade program, and out of 552 leading economists, replies favoring the program were received from 550. Every poll taken shows the same trend. A survey of the national press of the country, irrespective of party, was taken, and that shows that 82 percent of our newspapers—Republican and Democrat—favor reciprocal-trade agreements and only 9 oppose it. The others are noncommittal. That is 82 to 9—a little more than 9 to 1. I think that that would be occasion for thought on the part of some of my friends before they go before the country and make this a political issue.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am sorry I cannot yield, as I have not time.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman is mistaken so far as one newspaper that I know of is concerned, anyway.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, one out of a thousand. What does that mean? If I could not name more than one, I would say nothing.

I shall read now a brief editorial which I think is very pertinent, and which appeared yesterday, February 18, 1940, in the Baltimore Sun. That editorial reads as follows:

DEBATING POINTS AGAINST THE HULL PROGRAM

We have not had access to the complete text of the report of the Republican minority of the Ways and Means Committee on the trade agreements bill, but to judge by the rather full accounts of this document in the Washington dispatches, it is in the best tradition of the high school debating societies. The Republican critics of the Hull program show no grasp of fundamentals. On the contrary, they seem to have been content to make "points" against the reciprocal-trade agreements wherever points could be found, without reference to any coherent and consistent theory of their own.

A prime example of the debating-society technique is the argument that the trade agreements have not prevented the outbreak of the European war. Minority members of the committee made much of this argument during the hearings. It was and is their only answer to the insistence of the proponents of the trade agreements that no solid organization of world peace would be possible except under a system providing for mutually profitable exchanges of goods and services between nations in a free market and that the trade-agreements program affords the best American approach to such a system. To undertake to belittle this fundamental truth by harping on the fact that the European war has broken out since the trade-agreements program was initiated is to pit juvenility against statesmanship.

All the other debating points against the Hull program find a place in the minority report. That document includes even a proposal for a substitute program, which suggests that perhaps those who attack and belittle the trade agreements have a glimmer of perception that something along the lines of the present policy is needed in the modern world. But the Republicans do not undertake to outline their substitute. That would not be in accord with debating-society technique. Instead, they propose to leave the matter for further study and for decision at some future date—which date, it is sadly to be feared, would be long postponed if the minority party had its way. For the truth is that, while the Republicans originated the idea of reciprocal-tariff bargaining, they have never been able to stop giving special favors to tariff-protected industries long enough to put the idea to effective use. The McKinley tariff of 1890 and the Dingley tariff of 1897 provided for reciprocity agreements with other countries, but, as Dr. F. W. Taussig points out in his *Tariff History of the United States*, actual results under those provisions were of small value and short duration.

It has remained for the present Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, to work out a practical application of the system and to give it breadth and scope and promise for the future. His achievements are no doubt bitter pills for the supporters of Fordney and McCumber and Hawley and Smoot to swallow, but they make good medicine for the country, and the renewal of the Hull prescription is well justified.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. If I have made a misstatement, I would be very glad to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may proceed until he concludes his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman please supply the House with the names and addresses of the thousand economists who are in favor of this program?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman knows that this occurred. It never has been denied.

Their names were given at the time the Smoot-Hawley tariff law was enacted.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am sincere about it. I would like to know.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know that I can get the names of all of them, but it never has been questioned, as far as I know. If it is important to the gentleman I can verify it. I do not know that I could give the names of all of them. I do not know of any economist of any reputation whatever that took issue with them. More than a thousand of them came out in favor of it.

WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

It will be interesting, I am sure, to know what the women's organizations of the country think with regard to the trade-agreements program.

The principal women's organizations of the country were represented at the hearings just completed, and each and every one of these groups unanimously endorsed the trade-agreements program.

Mrs. Frederic Beggs, appearing for the General Federation of Women's Clubs, stated, among other things, as follows:

The Federation of Women's Clubs has in its membership more than 2,000,000 women. We have fifteen-thousand-some-odd clubs, and that means that there are 2,000,000 potential voters.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; I yield to the lady.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Were those statements from those women's clubs given before or after the hearings?

Mr. DOUGHTON. They were given during the hearings.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I asked because, after spending about a week going through these hearings, I did not see anything like that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. They were given during the hearings, and I can refer the lady to the page, chapter, and verse.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Since these hearings were concluded have you had any statements?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; not since the hearings were concluded. You would not expect them to reverse themselves in 2 weeks, would you? [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The statement to which the gentleman has referred will be found on page 2201 of the printed hearings, as well as all the other statements.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; and I would commend that to the prayerful consideration of the gentle lady from Illinois. [Laughter.]

Mrs. Beggs says further:

So I am really representing a very special interest as a large group of purchasers. And I am also representing a large body of public opinion in this country.

We are glad, as I have said before, that these hearings are being held, and I want to add a personal word, if I may, in the form of a good, solid, Republican conviction that leaders of the opposition party, to which I have the honor to belong, will not be showing particularly good judgment if they introduce the reciprocal trade-agreements program in the campaign of 1940 as a partisan issue because there are far too many Republicans who understand the issues involved and who are ready to rise spontaneously to the support of the program.

Mrs. Harris T. Baldwin, representing the National League of Women Voters, said:

The National League of Women Voters wishes to express its support of reenactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act * * * (p. 2205).

Finally, it has opened the way to overcome foreign-trade obstacles and to gain foreign-trade advantages through the reciprocal-trade agreements (p. 2207).

* * * We are equally convinced that the best interests of the United States will be served by keeping the program as a means of promoting sane international trade relations when wars abroad end (p. 2208).

Mrs. J. Austin Stone, representing the National Women's Trade Union League of America, said:

I represent the National Women's Trade Union League of America, which has a direct and affiliated membership of over a million (p. 2210).

Before concluding, I should like to say a word about the change in world conditions since the program was adopted. It is, of course, a peacetime measure; and some persons argue that because there is now war in other parts of the world, it is of no value and might as well be allowed to lapse. The Women's Trade Union League is convinced that this would be a tragic mistake both from the standpoint of labor and from that of the Nation as a whole. * * * It is of the utmost importance to keep machinery alive by which, when peace does come, the flow of world trade may be quickly resumed; and, in spite of many difficulties, the trade-agreements program has already demonstrated its great usefulness in this respect (p. 2212).

Let me say to the gentle lady from Illinois that not a single woman appeared before the committee in opposition to this. All four of the women who did appear were among the most intelligent I have ever known. They appeared before our committee representing large organizations and spoke in support of the program. Not a single woman appeared there to utter one word in opposition to it. That must be very, very singular.

Dr. Caroline F. Ware, representing the American Association of University Women, stated:

I am here to speak from the point of view of the American consumer in support of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. * * *

The American Association of University Women, which I represent, is an association of more than 65,000 members who are graduates of colleges and universities of high standing. * * *

My association has joined with the American Home Economics Association, numbering 15,000 professional members, and another 70,000 in student groups, and with the General Federation of Women's Clubs of over 2,000,000 members, in forming, with representatives of retail organizations, the National Consumer-Retailer Council.

The reciprocal trade-agreements program constitutes the first sustained effort on the part of the Government to consider the needs of the consumers as well as the desire of producers in the formulation of national tariff policies. Although consumers are the largest economic interest in the population, for we are all consumers, they have not been heard in the process of tariff making in the past (pp. 2213, 2214).

Dr. Ware, on page 2217, also has the following to say:

By means of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, American consumers have begun to secure consideration in the development of tariff policies. We do not want to go back. We urge the extension of the act in order that we may retain this small gain, at least until such time as the paramount interest of Americans as consumers receives wider recognition in all aspects of our national life, and production and trade are seen as means to an end, not as ends in themselves. We urge the Representatives of all districts to think not only of factories but of homes.

I cannot conclude my remarks in support of this farsighted and extremely beneficial program without rendering tribute to the one man, above all others, whose statesmanship, broad experience, wisdom, foresight, tact, and perseverance have made the administration of the reciprocal-trade program so successful. In my opinion, the Honorable Cordell Hull is one of the greatest Secretaries of State this Nation has ever produced. His outstanding public service and untiring, intelligent efforts to improve our relations with other countries specially entitle him to the unanimous acclaim of every citizen, not only of our own country but of all the nations of the world.

He has earned and has been given a place in the minds and hearts of his countrymen that will remain so long as our Nation endures. Statesman, scholar, thinker, and man of action, his record will stand as a monument which neither the passage of time nor the achievements of others can ever dim or destroy.

I thank you. [Applause.]

EXCERPTS FROM EDITORIALS

The American manufacturer and the American farmer are just about the most efficient in the world. The much vaunted cheap foreign labor, generally much more poorly equipped and managed, cannot displace them in the world markets in a fair fight.

This is illustrated in Venezuela which last year purchased \$52,000,000 worth of goods from the United States. That was 56 percent of all its outside purchases.

Why didn't the cheap foreign labor of other countries get this business? It was because it couldn't deliver such articles as wheat, prepared milk, radios, lard, steel products, refrigerators, paints, and other items. * * *

Trade across international borders, as well as within a nation, provides more business, more wealth to consume, more jobs, more prosperity. (Knickerbocker News (Independent Republican), Albany, N. Y., November 11, 1939.)

Prior to the adoption of the original Trade Agreements Act in 1934, tariff legislation had been going from bad to worse. Advocates of prohibitive duties on sugar got together with advocates of high duties on wool, and the two groups collaborated with those who wanted high duties on cheese and butter and beef, and the result was an orgy of logrolling in which the interests of the Nation as a whole were forgotten. * * * (Baltimore Sun (Independent Democrat), January 12, 1940.)

* * * Most of those who are today attempting to destroy our trade program by making insupportable charges that it is injuring agriculture are the same false prophets who solemnly assured the farmers that the Hawley-Smoot embargoes would guarantee to them full and permanent prosperity; whereas, in actual fact, within 2 years from the enactment of the 1930 tariff, millions of farmers found themselves in or on the verge of bankruptcy. * * * Analysis of the results obtained under the trade-agreements program reveals that between 1935 and 1938 our exports of farm products to trade-agreement countries increased by nearly 50 percent, whereas to other countries they actually declined slightly. (The Times (Independent Democrat), Bayonne, N. J., December 5, 1939.)

* * * Does the United States want to trade or not? That is the larger issue. If it wishes to develop the great opportunity for exports to Latin America it must learn to take imports. And if it wishes to build Pan Americanism on sound economic foundations the United States must put trade which would benefit the Nation as a whole ahead of local fears of competition. (Christian Science Monitor, January 9, 1940.)

The object of the reciprocal-trade treaties has consisted in promoting commerce among nations through a reduction of tariffs. Like all economic problems broadly affecting the Nation, it should be approached dispassionately. It is unfortunate, therefore, that Secretary of State Hull, who has labored long, arduously, and sincerely in behalf of the trade pacts, is now obliged to confront palpably partisan and unsubstantiated claims tending to disparage his accomplishments. * * * (Boston Transcript (Independent Republican), December 9, 1939.)

* * * Whether the name "reciprocal-trade program" endures is not important, but the principles will have to be retained. Either we market these surpluses abroad or we must be content with want and plenty. (The News (Republican), Cleveland, Ohio, December 4, 1939.)

For the first time tariff problems are being handled honestly and scientifically. * * * It would be a political and economic crime to go back to the scandalous methods of Smoot-Hawley days. (The Times, Chicago, Ill., November 28, 1939.)

It is unfortunate that the tariff is being drawn once more into party politics, after a period of 5 years of relatively scientific tariff making. The trade agreements have been imperfect, of course. But they represent an immense step forward from the logrolling tactics Congress used for decades previously in the framing of tariffs. They also represent the most important contribution the United States can make toward a more tolerable world order. (Cincinnati Enquirer, November 29, 1939.)

Shall individual interests fix tariff rates to their own liking, let the volume of foreign trade fall where it may, or does volume of trade have a prior right as an item of national public welfare? * * * We believe that stimulating foreign trade is an essential part of stimulating private enterprise. * * * (The News (Republican), Cleveland, Ohio, January 8, 1940.)

The Hull reciprocal-trade agreements are under fire in Washington, and the fire will get hotter and hotter as we get nearer into 1940 with its conventions and election. * * * The voter, therefore, will do well to remember several things when the proposed barrage is laid down against the Hull agreements. He should remember that politics has much to do with it. He should remember, when his selfish interests are appealed to, that what may touch him lightly, if at all adversely, may be for the good of the Nation and the world as a whole. (The Democrat (Democrat), Davenport, Iowa, November 29, 1939.)

Conceivably there have been some minor inequities, involving particular farm products; these are matters of detail and are righted as rapidly as possible. But if the farmer has any recollection of the early 1930's he will take a long look before deserting the trade-agreement program. (The Register (Independent), Des Moines, Iowa, November 28, 1939.)

Think it over, farmers: * * * Again, now, as in the 1936 campaign, the air is full of assertions that American agriculture is being victimized for the benefit of American manufacturing industries by the trade-agreements program, which aims at cautious lowering of international-trade barriers.

In 1936 the phrase was "sold down the river."

Since all the preposterous charges in that period about our farmers having been victimized proved false alarms, this phrase is less used now. But it will probably bob up again. * * *

Every powerful industrial influence that in the past, during all of our times, has been fighting to benefit itself through sky-high tariff protection, at enormous cost to agriculture and to all other consumers of "protected" industrial products, is energetically behind the drive to destroy the trade-agreements program. Why?

Think it over, Mr. Farmer. (Des Moines Register (Independent), January 7, 1940.)

One of the major objectives of the reciprocal policy has been the opening of international channels of trade. It does not abandon protection, but it makes concessions in order that these channels may be developed, providing a greater two-way traffic between this country and other nations. In this broad policy it is the intent to gain benefits for a broad field of American products instead of following the narrow policy of giving absolute protection to a few at the expense of the many. * * * (The Press (Independent), Grand Rapids, Mich., December 9, 1939.)

The trade agreements represent the best way to open foreign markets, which the farmer must have for the sake of his own surpluses and which the industrial worker must have if he is to keep at work and be in a position to buy agricultural goods. To an extent that can hardly be measured, the farmer depends upon the trade agreements to maintain his markets, both foreign and domestic. * * *

The Republicans may as well realize that they cannot win the next Presidential election merely by an inchoate, contradictory appeal to the prejudices of varied blocs of voters. Such a program

was attempted in 1936, and it failed miserably. If the Republicans are to win, they must convince the voters that they have a program of action that in both its domestic and its foreign aspects makes consistent sense. Reciprocal-trade agreements are an integral part of such a program, for they offer the only feasible device by which surpluses, both agricultural and industrial, can find their way into foreign markets, thereby making for prosperity at home and for peace abroad. For further particulars, read the last speech of that great Republican protectionist, William McKinley. (The Courant (Republican), Hartford, Conn., November 25, 1939.)

Much has been written about the moral obligation of the United States to use her vast economic power to create a better world, in which advantages will be more equitably distributed. In such a world, it is admitted, the threat of war would be diminished greatly.

We hope some Republican orator or the spokesman for some protectionist industry will explain how that can be done by returning to the Smoot-Hawley tariff philosophy. (The Post, Houston, Tex., November 28, 1939.)

The last Republican tariff, enacted in 1930, was directly responsible for the establishment of foreign-trade barriers against American commerce. It aided in destroying the farmer's market. Hundreds of economists warned against its effects. Even Herbert Hoover signed it reluctantly. But the grabbing, selfish interests had their way. American industry and agriculture, instead of being protected, were dealt a crushing blow in those early depression years when they needed a stimulant rather than a club. * * *

The trade agreements rank with social security and bank-deposit insurance among the reforms made in the last 7 years. To abolish them would be a senseless step backward. (The Journal (Independent), Kansas City, Mo., January 8, 1940.)

The protective tariff is a game of boycott at which two can play, and every country in the world has played to its own hurt. When a European settlement is reached, we may find ourselves competing with a united world, including South and Central America, unless we do some adjusting beforehand. Industrialists and financiers have begun to realize this; but an old generalization is revived to fool the farmers. * * * The real organized and financed fight against the New Deal is waged by those who wish to regain financial control of the Nation. Farmers have only to look back over the last half century to see what that would do to agricultural policies. (The Courier Journal, Louisville, Ky., December 7, 1939.)

That dairy farmers of Wisconsin have probably been fed more misinformation and falsehood on the reciprocal-trade agreements than on any other single subject affecting the interests of agriculture. * * * (The Times (Independent), Madison, Wis., December 13, 1939.)

The response to the Hoover-Grundy law was reprisals by 29 nations, among them Canada, our most important customer. There was no unfriendliness in this; there was only recognition that a producer must buy from those who buy from him. It is the way he has of paying.

The only blow struck at the Hawley-Smoot tariff in the 9 years since its enactment has been the Hull trade agreements. * * *

Politicians love a tariff issue. It saves them from having to think. The Republican Party for years pointed out to the farmer that what he produced was on the free list. It gave him a higher duty and put a countervailing duty on manufactures the farmer had to buy, thus taking from agriculture any gains it possibly could have made.

The same old talk is being revived today by men looking for a befogging issue to reelect them next year. * * * The Republican Party's policy of tariff subsidies to manufacturers with deceiving lip service to agriculture, pursued from the Civil War on, nearly wrecked this country in the 1920's and early thirties. Is it the idea of Republican leaders that they should finish the job? (The Journal (Independent), Milwaukee, Wis., December 3, 1939.)

The best and surest way to scuttle the reciprocal-trade program would be to require Senate ratification of trade treaties negotiated by the executive branch of Government, a procedure which many Senators favor. * * *

It would be a major mistake if the reciprocal treaties, which already have proven their worth in boosting foreign trade and stimulating domestic production, were now to be cast to the mercies of lawmakers, who would seize upon them to make political capital and to help them in their "horse-trading" deals with their colleagues. * * * (The Star Journal (Independent), Minneapolis, Minn., December 28, 1939.)

A lot of us are inclined to approve of Secretary Hull's trade policy as applied to all lines except our own. * * * Some people are beginning to suspect that we can't increase sales abroad unless we increase purchases. It's about time for a serious study of this whole question by the public and by Congress. * * * (The News (Independent), Minot, N. Dak., December 4, 1939.)

This opposition to the reciprocal-trade program, which many consider a prescription for lasting peace if universally accepted,

must be resisted by the Nation. The country's national welfare must not be subjugated to selfish private interests. For how can the United States expect to sell abroad while refusing to buy in return? (The Register (Independent Democrat), Mobile, Ala., November 28, 1939.)

If the treaty opponents can't kill the program they would like to suspend it. Their argument is that the war has so disturbed trade conditions as to make the effect of the agreements uncertain. But that probably is a cloak hiding other reasons which won't stand open discussion. It certainly is not convincing. If the treaties have had the effect of creating order and confidence in the trade between nations, it stands to reason that steadying influence will be most needed now and after the war. It is conceivable that in the post-war confusion the treaty system might become the solid mooring post to which the world can tie its foreign-trade relations. On the other hand, there probably could be no better way to breed more chaos than by continued pursuit of the theories of high tariffs, self-sufficiency and isolation. (Times-Picayune, New Orleans, La., December 6, 1939.)

To strike at the trade-agreements policy will be to strike a blow at peace and international cooperation. To renew the policy will be to reassert our faith that nations are not mere competitors in a ruthless struggle for markets, but mutual customers, dependent on each other and able to supply one another's essential needs in a spirit of equality and good will. (New York Times, December 19, 1939.)

To return to the logrolling and political deals of the patchwork tariff days, and thereby invite repetition of inevitable reprisals, would be a definite step backward—in trade as well as in the promotion of world peace. (The Oregon Journal (Independent-Republican) Portland, Oreg., December 26, 1939.)

Facts, not emotional prejudices, the whole rather than the partial effect of the Hull agreements, should determine their fate. (The Oregon Journal (Independent-Republican) Portland, Oreg., January 8, 1940.)

The Smoot-Hawley tariff was in many parts simply a bill to highjack the American consumer. It is still on the books because it seemed better trading to get from other nations a lower tariff on our imports than just to lower our barriers hoping they would go big-hearted, too, and lower theirs out of Christian charity. That was what the trade agreements now under fire, tried to do. * * * They do not show great harm to any important group in agriculture, industry, or labor, but show a great good to all groups, to all consumers, to reemployment and the country as a whole.

So what's all the shooting for? Obviously it is either to protect the Smoot-Hawley schedules or it is an effort, in a new high-carnival of old-time logrolling lobbying, to soak the consumer with even higher rates. (One Man's Opinion, by Hugh S. Johnson, Washington News, January 10, 1940.)

If the volume of foreign imports is further restricted and their price raised, several effects on American business are inevitable: American consumers must pay more for some of the things they need; American manufacturers must pay more for some of their raw materials. The result will be to raise their expense of doing business and to restrict the market for their product because of higher prices if they attempt to pass this added price on to the consumers. And finally, since imports are ultimately the only means that the outside world has of paying for American goods—barring a certain amount of more unneeded and unwanted gold—we are bound to cut down our exports to the same extent we cut down our imports. The result can only be to injure our farmers and manufacturers and to create internal disequilibrium. * * * If the Republicans as a body vote for the defeat of the Hull trade policy, if they demand a policy of embargo tariffs, they will be guilty not merely of bad economics but of bad politics. * * * (New York Times, January 12, 1940.)

This program is not popular with lobbyists. Back in the days of Smoot-Hawley and Fordney-McCumber and Payne-Aldrich, tariff making was almost the exclusive province of lobbyists skilled in applying pressure on Congressmen, masters of back scratching and logrolling. The Hull idea of having the trade experts of our Government get together with the trade experts of some other government and arrive at an agreement for the mutual benefit of both countries, is directly opposite to the lobbyist's idea of the way to do business. * * * These are things to bear in mind as the tariff fight swings into crescendo in Washington. It will help the rest of us to remain more or less calm if we remember that most of the commotion is supplied by lobbyists singing for their supper. (Washington News, January 11, 1940.)

Too often in the past, discussion of the tariff program of this Nation has descended to the level of waving a tinned Polish ham under the nose of the voters and shouting: "This is what the Government is doing to our farmers—giving their markets to other nations."

The most elementary cerebration should lead one to the conclusion that foreign trade is a matter of give and take. We cannot expect to have good customers abroad if we are not good customers, too. Attacks on the Hull program which are not well-founded in facts and figures may boomerang on their authors. * * * (McKeesport News, McKeesport, Pa., January 13, 1940.)

The chief "come on" slogan, to catch the farmer vote on behalf of sky-high tariff policies is going to be, as usual "the American Market for the American Farmer."

Of course the farmer is not expected to do any heavy thinking as to what this implies. He has been fooled by it before. He is expected to be a push-over for the siren song again. * * * Inevitably, such policies of exclusion for all foreign goods implies terrific penalization of those huge parts of our agriculture that produce surpluses for export. * * * In short carried to its inevitable conclusion, a real policy of the absolute complete American market for the American farmer means the ending of our farm exports. * * * And it means rapidly throwing huge parts of our farm production over into competition, in the domestic markets, with farmers who are not now surplus producers.

In short, the seductive slogan "the American Market for the American Farmer" leads straight to economic disaster for farmers as a whole, more than any other class.

"Penny wise and pound foolish" is the wise old phrase that fits the policy—like a glove—that our farmers are now asked to follow. (Des Moines Register (Independent), Des Moines, Iowa, January 10, 1940.)

Of all the fake political nostrums ever peddled the American farmer, the protective tariff is doubtless the phoniest.

After that last big war, the farm-the-farmer lobbyists and politicians sold the Fordney-McCumber tariff as the sure cure for all rural aches and pains. The result was that foreign countries which had been buying our cotton, wheat, corn, hogs, cattle, etc., started growing their own and buying elsewhere. * * * An effort was made to remedy that by lending more dollars abroad, which was a good racket while it lasted. * * * So the lobbyists and politicians started their medicine show again. Their new concoction bore the label of Smoot-Hawley, and was guaranteed to cure the tuberculosis, cancer, lumbago, and gout of the farm belt, and give American farmers a monopoly on the American market. It almost made good on that latter claim, but in so doing it knocked in the head the farmer's foreign markets, far more important to him than a domestic monopoly. Though by 1932 there was scarcely a trickle of farm imports, that act did little good for our farmers who got 5 cents for their cotton, 10 cents for corn, and "two bits" for wheat. * * *

Once again the farmers of farmers, who pitched their medicine tents in the lobbies of Washington, are crying out the old quack cure. They want to abolish the Hull reciprocal-trade treatment and persuade the patient to take a suck out of the same old protective tariff bottle. Is there a farmer in the audience who, having taken that "cure" twice, still has enough strength to step forward and give a testimonial? (The News (Independent), San Francisco, Calif., January 13, 1940.)

Opponents of the trade-agreement policy fall into several groups. The high-tariff advocates naturally object to it. Men who wish to embarrass the Roosevelt administration may think this is a good way to do so. Sticklers for precedent in tariff making perhaps see in this a subversive practice.

We have no sympathy with any of these groups. The plan of adjustment by executive agreement has proved its value, and should not now be dropped. (Cleveland Plain Dealer (Independent Democrat), Cleveland, Ohio, January 13, 1940.)

Much ado has been made about the imports of foodstuffs without explaining how much of the total has been made up of non-competitive food articles like bananas, coconuts, and coconut oil, or such as cattle from Canada and Mexico, which the cattle feeders want. Skillfully planting their men in these farmers' organizations and beating the tom-tom about food imports, the manufacturers of the country have been able to scare these farmers' groups into passing resolutions denouncing the trade pacts.

This scheme of using the farmer as a mark is an old one. The farmers, as a whole, are too little informed of how protection will aid them, and do not realize that a tariff on most farm products does them no good. * * *

The ignorance of the farmer on this matter has been used by the Republicans, representing the industrialists, to support every tariff protection bill since the time of the Civil War. And so it is now with the trade treaties. Although the opposition cannot point to a single instance where industry or agriculture has been damaged, and although it carefully neglects telling about any of the benefits, it conjures up the bogeyman of foreign competition to frighten the farmer as a means of helping the industrialist. The poor farmer does not realize that he has been competing with the bogeyman of foreign competition even when he was assured the all-time high Smoot-Hawley tariff was in effect. * * * (The Star (I), Tucson, Ariz., January 16, 1940.)

The Hawley-Smoot tariff helped wreck American foreign trade, including the export market. The agreements are showing impressive results in reviving foreign trade, including the export

market. Yet the same crowd that hailed the destructive Hawley-Smoot tariff as a great achievement to bring America out of the depression is now fighting the trade agreements.

The question is whether the country shall turn back toward the Hawley-Smoot barriers, which were dictated by political considerations, or shall go forward on a competently worked out nonpolitical trade policy that has demonstrated its great value to American agriculture and industry. * * * (The Kansas City Times, Kansas City, Mo., January 12, 1940.)

When Governor Murphy of New Hampshire tells a House committee that the reciprocal trade agreement program "may imperil the very economic existence of our six (New England) States," he plainly is not dealing in known economic facts. Both New England and the Nation are more prosperous today than they were when the trade-agreements program was adopted. And one of the reasons for this better prosperity is the rise that has occurred in American exports since the program was put into effect. * * * (Providence Journal, January 24, 1940.)

It must have been something to listen to gentle slow-spoken Cordell Hull read his prepared statement on the reciprocal-trade agreements to the House Ways and Means Committee. * * *

Hull's worst enemies must admit it was an impressive performance. But while they are acknowledging this they had best look to their ammunition, for the facts that the mild-mannered Secretary of State marshaled in orderly review can't be laughed off; they can't be disregarded. If extension of the reciprocal-trade program were to be decided in a vacuum, on its merits alone without benefit of politics, it would not be too much to say that Hull all but won his case yesterday.

He did not stop with merely denouncing the "reckless claims" of "unscrupulous" critics. Any small-bore politician could have done that. Hull showed exactly why the claims are "reckless" and the critics "unscrupulous." With the accuracy of a hill-country squirrel shooter he ripped the dead center of the bull's-eye time after time. * * * (The Beacon-Journal (I. R.), Akron, Ohio, January 30, 1940.)

Unless the Congress can put forth some better means of promoting commerce it had best give careful attention to Secretary Hull's plea for continuance of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Making of these treaties has seemed to a great many observers a work of far-reaching importance. The plan is not to be lightly discarded, unless there is something better to replace it. Thus far it would appear that no program more effective for encouraging international trade has been offered. * * * The separate treaties thus far consummated may not be ideals of perfection. But at least in some instances they are filling what otherwise might be virtually a vacuum. Whatever their faults or their lack, they are contributing to commerce. So doing, they are promoting friendships. Many wish that they might be extended to more nations, even to those now "blacklisted." They should fill a more valuable role when war is over, in helping bring world-wide economic stability. * * * (Baton Rouge Times, Baton Rouge, La.)

Where the adverse publicity to the reciprocal-trade treaties comes from originally, we do not know. It may be the work of antineutral dealers who wish to discredit the administration on any point possible. It may come from industrialists and Congressmen of the type who more than 50 years ago kidded the western farmer into thinking that tariffs were his savior, his benefactor, his God Almighty.

Before the North Dakota farmer goes off the "deep end," he should be warned that cancelation of reciprocal-trade treaties will hurt the farmer, not help him; will make him and his country economically poorer, not richer; will tend to make them both politically insecure. * * * There is no reason, however, for the farmer to believe that every farm product shipped into the United States competes with him. He should not develop a persecution complex on the trade-treaty question. Before the farmer starts another farm-suicide trend he might find out what's to his benefit, compared with what appears to be for his own good. (Bismarck Capitol, Bismarck, N. Dak., December 28, 1939.)

Republican leaders in Congress look upon the reciprocal trade agreements program as the major issue in the next session, according to an Associated Press dispatch. Minority Leader MARTIN of Massachusetts and 22 other New England Republican Members have prepared exhaustive reports showing how the program has worked against New England industry, farming, and fishing.

For more reasons than one, this is a dangerous subject for the Republicans to take under their wing in the coming session. A year ago, when the world was more or less at peace, it would have been safer ground. But now the issue of peace for the United States has become of pressing importance, and the administration has been given the opportunity of emphasizing more strongly than ever the function of a free reciprocal trade policy in the preservation of friendly international relations. * * * We do not think there is much to be said for high protective tariffs as an economic expedient. At the moment, there seems to be even less to be said for them as a political expedient. A tariff plank might woo a few farmers away from the minifluence of the New Deal, and it would probably gratify a good many industrialists who are, however, already prepared to vote Republican come what may. But given

the sort of interpretation it is certain to receive from a democratic political organization that knows its business, the policy seems more likely to alienate large numbers of voters who will look at it as a sectional movement against the best interests of the Nation as a whole, and not calculated to promote the one thing we all hope for—peace. (The Herald (Independent), Rutland, Vt., December 28, 1939.)

There may be, and probably are, defects in the reciprocal-trade policy of the national administration, and certainly it is easy to find those who dislike it because it has resulted in some reduction of tariff barriers upon certain articles in which they are particularly interested. However, as it is a national policy intended to operate for the greatest good of the greatest number of our people, it seems fair to consider its effect on the Nation as a whole. * * * So on the face of the record the fact seems to be that, at least so far, the reciprocal-trade treaties certainly have not hurt us in the matter of favorable balance of foreign trade. We have sold abroad a surprisingly greater amount than we have bought from abroad, viewing the entire foreign-trade picture from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole, which is of course the proper view of a national policy. (The Press (Democratic), Sheridan, Wyo., January 5, 1939.)

Inasmuch as the trade-agreements controversy has taken on a dominantly partisan coloration, the President could hardly fail to defend this part of his program if only for political reasons. Insofar as attack is Republican in origin and partisan in motivation, it must be answered in like manner.

Beyond that, and far more important, is the fact that no administration—Republican or Democrat—could abandon such a promising contribution to the rebuilding of prosperity and peace without thereby confessing to a disregard for the national welfare.

The Hull program has been the target of many and varied shafts, but none has succeeded in finding a breach in the truth of these fundamental propositions: Artificial barriers to international trade destroy free markets and sources of supplies, hinder the exchange of surplus goods with its mutual benefits, and result in a universally lowered standard of living. Nations surrounded by such barriers tend to seek relief in forceful action. The negotiation of non-discriminatory reductions in trade barriers is the most practicable and the most promising method yet devised to promote the economic well-being of the United States and the peaceableness of other less fortunate nations. (The Dispatch (Independent), Minneapolis, Minn., January 5, 1940.)

The lesson in the relationship between external trade and internal prosperity which America has had since the imposition of the Hawley-Smoot tariff should have been enough to persuade labor of the fallacy of trying to raise the standard of living by cutting off imports of foreign-made goods, and of the necessity of reducing barriers to trade if prosperity is to be restored. * * * No imports means no exports; a curtailment of foreign market means ruin for large parts of the country and consequently a curtailed domestic market. The resulting lack of business means unemployment and low wages. (The Pioneer Press (Independent), St. Paul, Minn., December 18, 1939.)

The big point of distinction between the New Deal and this old principle of the Republican Party is that the New Deal does not content itself with giving protection to those who seek to have the Government protect their investments. The New Deal extends Government protection to labor and other groups. And if capital and profits are entitled to governmental protection, why should not labor and other groups get protection? The apparent justice of such an idea accounts for the strength of the New Deal. (The Star (Independent), Tucson, Ariz., November 23, 1939.)

"To separate foreign trade from politics." Shades of Willis Hawley and Reed Smoot. If ever politics sired a vampire to suck the life-blood out of our foreign trade the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930 was it. The Hull program, far from being bound up in politics, was designed to rid our foreign trade of the curse of politically logrolled tariff barriers behind which our commerce had languished. * * * Farmers will do well to regard skeptically the clever charges that the trade agreements have favored industry at their expense. * * * If he has a vivid recollection of the early 1930's—as what farmer has not?—surely he will hesitate before being sold that bill of shoddy goods again. (The Star Free Press (Independent), Ventura, Calif., November 27, 1939.)

The American people may well view with mingled emotions of regret and concern the political storm which is blowing up around the proposal to renew the reciprocal trade agreements program which will expire on June 12 unless legislation authorizing its continuance is enacted in the interim. In making a decision of this kind there is no place for partisan politics, no room for the manifestations of narrow sectionalism which have characterized some of our tariff policies in the past. It is a determination which calls for statesmanship of the highest order, and if the Congress fails to meet this requirement—if it does not look beyond the selfish arguments of special interest groups—it will have rendered a disservice to this country and to the world at large which will have evil consequences for many years to come. * * * The Hull program is not a panacea for all of the world's trade ills, and the obstacles confronting it are

increased manifold in time of war, but the Star most earnestly hopes that the trade-agreement legislation will be renewed by this Congress. When peace comes it must be founded upon some such forward-looking program, and for the United States to abandon Secretary Hull's policies at this time would be an unthinkable backward step. (The Star (Independent), Washington, D. C., January 10, 1940.)

In the present critical period of international affairs no statesman has managed to combine a passionate devotion to principle and the calm moderation of logical thought with greater success than Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Mr. Hull detests as cordially as any man the use of "arbitrary force as the basis of international conduct." But, while nearly every other national spokesman, both in this country and abroad, has occasionally given way to prejudice or fear, Mr. Hull has remained magnificently aloof on his own high plane. (The Journal Every Evening, Wilmington, Del., May 23, 1939.)

Were we to return to the old principle that we can erect high tariff walls to keep foreign goods out of America while, at the same time, expecting other nations to admit freely our manufactured products, it would be a great mistake. If we expect other nations to admit our products, we must be willing, in return, to admit their products to this country. If the lessons of the past have taught anything, it is this, and a great many American manufacturers realize it fully. * * * America needs world markets. The prosperity of business, industry, and labor depends upon our ability to sell our goods abroad. We cannot hope to retain such world markets, however, if we are unwilling to permit the entrance of foreign goods into this country and any argument to the contrary cannot stand. The Republican Party should not as a pure matter of political expediency take a position which it will find later is neither logical nor wise. (The Times (I. R.) Watertown, N. Y., January 8, 1940.)

As for this drive in Congress, it is backed by interests which feel that they have been definitely injured by the lowering of certain tariff rates in the reciprocal treaties now in operation, and by other interests which fear that they will be damaged by future treaties. * * * Whatever faults may be disclosed in Secretary Hull's practical handiwork, he is right in principle when he holds that increased trade is essential to the advancement of peace. (The Gazette (I. R.), Worcester, Mass., January 8, 1940.)

The board of commerce has taken a well-advised action. If tariffs are not to be thrown back to the mercies of the dicker-and-trade system in Congress, it is essential that the defense of the reciprocal system have expression on a scale and with determination meeting the vigor and intensity characterizing the concerted drive being made to do away with the trade bargains. (The News (I.), Detroit, Mich., January 23, 1940.)

The authority on which Secretary of State Hull and his aides have been acting is about to end and Congress is making up its mind whether to renew it.

The trouble is that this very important economic policy is being attacked in an atmosphere of partisan politics which results in exaggerated statements. It would be more convincing if those who talk or write about this matter would get down—painful as it is—to a study of facts. (Times-Star (Independent), Bridgeport, Conn., January 25, 1940.)

Mr. Hull's commendable work has never been more essential than today amid clashing and narrow nationalisms which have already precipitated one war and may lead to others. There are many ways of bringing about a friendly and cooperative world, and to trade for mutual benefit is certainly one of them. This is no time to abandon it. (Boston Evening Transcript, December 9, 1939.)

Even high-tariff Republicans admit that Mr. Hull's trade treaties have removed from Congress some of the worst aspects of log-rolling. If you pinned them down they would admit that congressional vote swapping is expensive for the country and raises the devil with wise national policy. * * * (Berkshire Eagle (I.), Pittsfield, Mass., December 29, 1939.)

Let this be a warning: Destroy reciprocal-trade agreements and you cast this Nation out of the role that history seems to have ordained for us in fashioning a world where free men can trade with their neighbors and through this trade give sustenance to the roots of peace. (The Evening Bulletin (Independent), Providence, R. I., January 11, 1940.)

Today agriculture, to live, must sell its surplus abroad. To do that it must exchange raw products for finished goods and other raw products. American industry, for the most part, is strong enough to compete with that of other nations. In those few instances where it is not, it should be protected.

But if we are to achieve a balanced economy, we must have a freer exchange of goods. Tariff dams will have to be destroyed. The water of commerce will have to flow in a steady stream for all to enjoy. You are going to hear a great deal shortly about "protection for our American industries," and most of it will be sheer,

unadulterated bunk, put out by selfish persons for their own profit. * * * (The Star-Tribune, Providence, R. I.)

The belief that the domestic farmer is being driven out of the domestic market by imported foreign products, therefore, appears to be without substantial foundation. The problem of the farmer, indeed, has quite different roots. As Mr. Hull points out, the United States normally produces not merely enough to satisfy domestic needs but a great surplus besides, which, if it is not sold abroad, means disastrously low domestic prices, with consequent agricultural distress. And the only way in which the agricultural surpluses can be sold abroad is to make arrangements with other nations whereby they can sell more of their products in the United States in exchange for wheat, cotton, and lard. Indeed, the administration has endeavored so diligently to find outlets for surplus agricultural products that the workers of the East have sometimes been led to complain that they, not the farmer, are being "sold down the river."

The fact is that neither the farmers nor the workers of the United States are being sold out by a policy whose chief purpose is to facilitate the production and exchange of goods. For every item sold by a foreign producer in the United States, the United States sells another item abroad. * * * The realization that closed markets and restricted production, whether on a national scale or an international, means not increased prosperity but only shared poverty for everyone, whether he be a domestic producer or a foreign, whether he be a farmer or a worker, may be hard to learn; but it must be learned if the world, and the United States included, is to resume its progress toward economic democracy. * * * (The Courant (Republican), Hartford, Conn., August 2, 1939.)

The proposed attack on the Reciprocal Tariff Act brings dismaying evidence that some in the Republican Party are still living in the past century. * * * (The Courant (Republican), Hartford, Conn., August 27, 1937.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 1 hour and 12 minutes.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the close of the tariff debate in 1930 a member of the majority of the committee at that time made the following statement concerning the Hawley-Smoot bill, and I inject it at this part of the discussion because reference has been made to it on several occasions and I want it to appear in the RECORD as a correct quotation. The paragraph reads as follows:

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, once this bill becomes a law confidence will be immediately restored, we shall gradually work out of the temporary slump we have been in for the last few months and once more prosperity will reign supreme, foreign reprisals will vanish into thin air, and we shall continue to raise the standard of American labor and American wages. We shall dissipate the dark clouds of your gloomy prophecy with the sunshine of a continuing prosperity.

The prophet stands before you, discredited to some extent by the sequence of unfortunate world events that followed the passage of that bill. I might rightfully trespass on your time and your patience in order to establish a long list of alibis, but I shall not do that. I shall refrain, and comfort myself with the knowledge that at least I thought I was right. Being right, of course, does not always bring its own reward. I am reminded of an epitaph on a man's tombstone who had been killed in an automobile accident. The epitaph ran something like this:

Here lies the body of Jonathan Hay
Who died disputing the right of way.
He said he was right, that's the same old song,
But he's just as dead as if he'd been wrong.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a good deal of discussion here today about tariff bills and tariff policies and I hope a little later on to have something to say about the way my friends on this side of the House handled tariff bills some few years ago. Do you know that only 6 Members of this Seventy-sixth Congress were Members of the House when the Underwood-Simmons bill was written and became the law? There are only 28 Members of the present Congress who were here when the Fordney-McCumber bill was enacted into law. There are less than 100, or considerably less than 25 percent of the present membership of the House, who were here when the Hawley-Smoot bill became law. Such are the ravages of time, political hysteria, and of death. Thus the matter of tariff discussion, pro and con, to the

other 332 Members of the House is largely a matter of tradition.

During the debates on the 1913 bill the free-trade policy had many staunch supporters in this Congress, but as good judgment displaced prejudice during the lapse of years, by the time the Fordney-McCumber bill was presented our friends on the Democratic side had thrown up a breastwork defense which they labeled "tariff for revenue only." There were scarcely a half dozen who still clung to the outmoded fetish of free trade. That showed a remarkable advance in constructive thinking. The tariff has been a burning issue over a long period of years, and not very much that is new has been uttered in defense of or against its merits. The two closing speeches on the Wilson bill in 1893, one by the Honorable Thomas Brackett Reed and the other by the then Speaker of the House, Mr. Crisp, have always seemed to me to be the most complete in their analysis and conclusions.

It is interesting at this time to note that when the Wilson bill was found to be incapable of producing the revenue necessary even at that time, an amendment was added providing for our first income tax, calculated to provide \$75,000,000 in revenue, which the tariff did not provide. That amendment was adopted and became part of the law, but was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. It is interesting to remember that at that time the returns from the customhouse practically paid the expenses of running the Federal Government. To the new dealer who thinks only in billions, customhouse revenues are mere "chicken feed."

It appears from the speeches and the remarks that were made during the hearings that my friends, the Democrats, have at last found a tariff policy that apparently meets with their approval. They have been a long time arriving at this conclusion. In 1912 the Democratic Party reiterated a previous charge they had made that the laying of tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue was unconstitutional. In 1916 they advocated a tariff for revenue only; in 1920 a tariff for revenue. They omitted the "only." In 1924 they advocated a competitive tariff, and in 1928, according to the famous Raskob telegram, Democratic congressional candidates were all "in the bag" for a protective tariff, and business had nothing to fear if Al Smith was elected. In 1932 they demanded the repeal of the Hawley-Smoot Act, and they romped and ranted up and down the hustings vociferously berating this law and promising to deal it a death blow when they were placed in power.

Seven years, seven long years, have taken wing and the Hawley-Smoot Act is still on the statute books, somewhat battered and bruised, but still in the ring. In view of subsequent developments along trade-treaty lines, what a material advantage they had in having the Hawley-Smoot rates to use for trading purposes. The rates in the Underwood-Simmons bill would have provided no opportunity to trade.

Now, reckless statements are constantly made about how much the ultimate consumer has to pay when we have a protective tariff. I remember one witness appearing before us this year who appeared in 1929. He appeared for an industry that has been harder pressed to hold 50 percent of its business in this country than any other industry in the United States. I refer to the pottery industry. In answer to the reckless statements as to what additional burden some of the rates would place upon consumers, I am going to quote from the evidence of Mr. Wells. This is a short paragraph appearing on page 1276 of the hearings in 1929. He made the following statement:

Our prices today are much lower than they were in 1922. When the Fordney-McCumber bill was passed prophecies were made by the friends of importers on the floor of the Senate that the addition of a small ad valorem duty would increase the price to the housewives of this country by \$12,000,000 in their annual purchases. The actual fact is that they are buying American and foreign dishes today, in 1929, for 25 percent less than they bought them in 1922.

No substantial evidence has been offered at any time that the Hawley-Smoot Act caused a rise in prices. In those days

and even now I sometimes feel that placing the tariff policy in the hands of the Democratic Party is a good deal like placing an osteopath in charge of an allopathic hospital because he gave his own children castor oil. It is just about as appropriate.

I notice my very dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, made some reference to the terrifically bad treatment the Democrats received when the Hawley-Smoot bill was being considered. He said they were not allowed to offer amendments and were not allowed to consider the measure. All tariff bills have been written in executive session by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, irrespective of which party was writing the tariff bill, and they have all been considered very largely under what might be considered by some as a gag rule because you never could get through with it any other way. I want particularly to call your attention to a report I have here, taken from the New York Times in 1913, when the Underwood-Simmons bill was under consideration in the House, just to indicate their liberality and also the method used by my Democratic friends at that time. I desire to do this because in 1930 Mr. GARNER, the distinguished Vice President of the United States, then a Member of the House, said to the Republicans, when the Hawley-Smoot bill was about to be considered:

I solicit of you at least honesty in the consideration of it. You should consider it according to the rules of the House and not put it on its passage without full and free discussion.

Let us see what happened when the Underwood-Simmons bill was being considered.

APRIL 9, 1913.

The Democrats this day began consideration of the tariff bill behind closed doors in a party caucus, proceeding under the 5-minute rule. Schedules A and B, chemicals, etc., were taken up. All proposed amendments to the committee bill were defeated.

The press report states that President Wilson revisited the Capitol—evidently he had been there before—for the purpose of conferring with Members on the proposed bill. The following is an excerpt from the article as it appeared in the New York Times:

Some of the amendments under consideration by the President and his Cabinet, as well as in the House and Senate, involved correction of obvious oversights on the part of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee. One of these was the leaving of mohair with a duty of 20 percent while raw wool was put on the free list.

Mohair is the coat of the Angora goat, raised extensively in Texas. The 20 percent on mohair remained in the bill in spite of the President's visit to the Capitol, but a duty on wool was denied although offered in the committee. Representative Dies, the father of our distinguished Representative DRES, sought a duty of 15 percent ad valorem, but the sheep's wool was not to be considered, nothing but the mohair of the goat, and the wool duty was not allowed.

So every schedule was considered in Democratic caucus. The votes are here given. It was one of those caucuses that must have leaked. The vote is given on all these propositions. The cotton schedule was completed, it being adopted without change. A proposal to increase the rate on collars was defeated 96 to 27.

Then on April 18 other standing committee amendments were adopted and in accordance with an understanding of the previous day and in response to pressure from various sources, the committee agreed to rescind their action in the matter of placing a duty of 50 cents a pound on vanilla beans.

That sounds a little bit like logrolling, does it not? "Pressure from outside sources." Discussion on the wool schedule was continued. Representative Bathwick, of Ohio, offered an amendment to put ready-made clothing on the free list. The vote was 99 against and 68 in favor of the motion.

That is sufficient to show you that very little attention should be paid to the criticism leveled at us by our distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and others with regard to the unfair treatment accorded them.

Mr. BOEHNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BOEHNE. When the Underwood bill was written in 1913 in 1914 did we not have a pattern to go by; namely, the Payne-Aldrich bill of 1908 or 1909?

Mr. CROWTHER. I am not discussing the pattern of your bill.

Mr. BOEHNE. I was speaking of the pattern of drawing up the bill.

Mr. CROWTHER. You can go farther back than that. You can go back to the old Wilson-Gorman bill and the Dingley bill, where you would find similar patterns.

Mr. BOEHNE. The Payne-Aldrich bill was fresh in the minds of both parties in 1913.

Mr. CROWTHER. I do not think the query is particularly relevant. I simply desire to show the uniformity of procedure by both political parties. To sum up, the Underwood-Simmons bill was written by the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee and was considered for amendment first in a Democratic caucus under the 5-minute rule. I do not remember that we ever followed that procedure on our side of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman might not remember that the Republicans ever considered any such matters in caucus, but the gentleman certainly will remember that when his party was in power they adopted the tactics, as did the Democrats, of writing their own revenue bills and tariff bills at all times.

Mr. CROWTHER. I so stated a moment ago.

Mr. COCHRAN. This occurred not only on this side of the Capitol but on the other side, because at one time I happened to be secretary to a Senator who was on the Senate Finance Committee, and that was the policy over there as it was here.

Mr. CROWTHER. May I again state to the gentleman from Missouri that I have already testified to that effect?

Of course, the word was passed around that the Republicans had about as much chance of getting an amendment of any kind adopted as the proverbial snowball had of maintaining its integrity in the torrid temperature of hades. But enough of that. I believe the criticism will probably cease in the future with regard to the method of handling tariff bills. Let us get a little closer to the subject at hand, because, as I say, a good deal of water has gone over the dam since the Democrats declared the policy of tariff-raising for anything except revenue unconstitutional. Woodrow Wilson held that view in one of his books, but he afterward withdrew his former statement on that subject.

There has been some criticism about my inconsistency in even prophesying that there would be a period of prosperity following the Hawley-Smoot Act. I just want to call attention to one or two more inconsistencies that developed on the other side of the House. When we had the flexible clause in the 1930 bill, and it was also in the 1922 bill, it was singled out by several Members of the House as their particular grievance against the bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], now the Vice President, and several others used that for their text. They did not say much about rates at that time but they did inveigh against the policy of the flexible tariff.

Comparing the flexible-tariff provision of 1922 and of 1930 with the reciprocal-trade-treaty program is about like comparing chickenpox with smallpox. It is certainly a tremendously milder proposition than the trade-treaty program.

Many even on the Democratic side feel that the State Department went clear beyond the intent of Congress in changing the excise taxes, particularly on oil. But mild as the flexible clause was, it was the subject of most vociferous and vitriolic criticism both here and in the body at the other end of this building. A round robin was signed by the members of the Finance Committee at the other end of the Capitol inveighing against the adoption of this policy. My distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], in a speech at that time, when the 1930 act was under consideration, had this to say

about tariff making by the Executive, and remember that is what we have now—tariff making by the Executive. Let me read what the gentleman from North Carolina had to say at that time:

The administrative features are subversive of our system, idea, and ideals of government; and if enacted into law will be a violation of the fundamental principles upon which it rests.

The fathers who framed the Constitution, wisely, in my opinion, left to Congress the initiating and enacting of laws raising revenue. The flexible provision giving the President the power to raise or lower tariff rates to the amount of 50 percent renders nugatory in spirit and practical effect this provision of the Constitution.

In my opinion—

This is Chairman Doughton speaking—

we have gone a long way too far already, in the centralization of power in the Executive head of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, what a distance we have come since then! Centralization of power, once anathema to the Democratic Party, has now been adopted as their slogan.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That statement was made before we had suffered the effects of the death sentence of the Smoot-Hawley bill. We were dealing then with natural and normal conditions, but we are dealing now with desperate emergency conditions brought about by the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

Mr. CROWTHER. We have heard that word "emergency" for 7 long years. I may say to my good chairman that for 2 years under the Hawley-Smoot bill we had an improvement of 16 percent per year in our foreign trade.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman please put in the Record what President Hoover said about prosperity being just around the corner?

Mr. CROWTHER. I do not believe the gentleman will insist on my putting anything of that kind in my remarks. May I suggest to him that there is a lurking suspicion that real prosperity is still around the corner and 10,000,000 unemployed will so testify.

I again read from my distinguished chairman's speech.

If this bill is enacted into law he will have the power of life and death over industry, all manufacturing enterprises, a complete autocratic power affecting agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, there is a word picture of warning as to what might happen. My chairman has vision. He has almost qualified as a clairvoyant. [Laughter.]

Again I quote:

My friends, this is too dangerous and alarming to contemplate. With all this power vested in the President of the United States he becomes a colossus. It is too much power and authority to lodge in any man who ever has been, is now, or ever will be President of the United States. In fact, with all this unrestricted and unlimited power he would be in a better position to overthrow our form of government and proclaim himself king than was the first consul of France, the great Napoleon, when he overthrew the French Government and proclaimed himself emperor.

It seems that the more power men are given the more they are obsessed with a morbid gluttony for increased power. My friends, it is time to pause and call a halt; to stop, think, look, and listen before we go over the yawning precipice just ahead of us.

Then our very distinguished Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, with whom it was my pleasure to serve for many years on the Ways and Means Committee, and whose views regarding a protective tariff I was familiar with at all times, because when he was on the committee you could get a very decisive yes or no from him on almost any question of importance, but when he appeared before our committee in behalf of the trade treaties I noticed he had adopted the language and the manner of the diplomat, and you could never get him to say yes or no. It was always a continual reiteration of a previous statement and saying, "I think I answered that before." This reminded me of a chap who once said to me that everybody in the Diplomatic Service ought to learn to speak Spanish, because you could talk more in Spanish without saying anything than any other language in the world. [Laughter.]

Now, Secretary Hull at the time the Hawley-Smoot bill was passed was a Member of the Senate of the United States, and he was likewise terrifically disturbed about this flexible clause and this power that was going to be given to the President, and he said in the Senate:

It is clearly unsound, unwise, impracticable, subversive of the plain functions of Congress, and should be speedily repealed.

He also said this:

The proposed enlargement and broad expansion of the provisions and functions of the flexible tariff clause is astounding. It is undoubtedly unconstitutional and is violative of the functions of the American Congress. Not since the countries wrenched from an English king the power and authority to control taxation has there been a transfer of the taxing power back to the head of the Government on a basis so broad and so unlimited as is proposed in this pending bill. As has been said on former occasions, this is too much power for a bad man to have or for a good man to want.

I have often wondered just where this new policy of reciprocal-trade treaties came from. Of course, to my mind, it has always been a plain, straightforward—well, I would not say straightforward hardly; I would like to modify that—it has been a cleverly designed method of gradually reducing the rates of the Hawley-Smoot bill, coupled with a suggestion as to the maintenance of peace and courting the friendliness of the world. Of course, that is about all they could do, as they did not have the intestinal stamina to repeal the Hawley-Smoot bill. They would not have dared to go to the country with the policy that is developing under this plan.

They would not have dared to go to the country in 1936 with a declaration that they were going to reduce 42 percent of the items in the tariff bill 39.2 percent flat average right along the line. They would not have dared to do that, but they concluded they could do it by this inside, gnawing, method under the trade-treaty program, and do you know where they got that idea from? I will tell you. I found it in an old volume, dated 1911, 29 years ago.

They were considering the Canadian reciprocity treaty at that time and John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, made the minority report, and he had found in a magazine an article from which he quoted at that time, just a few lines, "In a magazine article published a few years ago, Mr. Williams, of Mississippi, now a Senator-elect from that State"—you see, in 1911, when the minority report was written on the Canadian treaty, he was Senator-elect from Mississippi, and he had written this article criticizing the tariff, and he issued this advice, and this is significant, happening so many years ago:

There is also a tariff revision by piecemeal. This is the tariff revision by reciprocal-trade agreements with other nations. Much can be done along this piecemeal line of tariff revision under a Democratic or an approximately Democratic law.

Evidently that is where it all commenced because never during any discussion that I ever heard of the tariff in the 22 years of my service, did I ever hear anybody offer any suggestion that we adopt a reciprocal-trade program as a substitute for a tariff bill, neither when the Democrats were discussing a bill or when the Republicans were discussing a bill.

Mr. Chairman, any nation is justified in establishing import duties high enough to protect its standard of living against low-wage-paying countries. Under present conditions our protection is totally inadequate. Because of this unique position of our country we cannot expect any increase in percentage of imports without untold harm to our employment situation. We can look forward, however, to an increase in dollar value of our foreign trade, but this increase will depend wholly upon our increase in domestic prosperity. Every economist and everybody who is not an economist knows, as well as everyone who is well versed in the mechanics of foreign trade, that expansion of our exports can only be obtained by a great increase in production of our goods and services for domestic purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. Our present foreign-trade policy, which brings about an increasing flow of competitive foreign products, both

manufactured and farm products, does not create a proportionate increase of production of domestic goods but results in the curtailment of domestic production, and in industrial and farm-labor unemployment. No international drum-beating, conferring, and trading can start our industries in full motion and raise the country from the depths of depression.

Trade-treaty proponents have contended all along that any abandonment of the present trade-treaty program would mean going back to "isolationism" and "embargo tariffs." The answer is that it would mean nothing of the kind. We never had a policy of embargo tariffs before the program was inaugurated, and I know of no one who seriously suggests such a policy.

The Republican tariff policy does not seek and does not result in, the exclusion of foreign goods. The most that it does is simply to equalize competitive conditions in the home market as between domestic producers and low-cost foreign producers so that the foreign producer will not come into our market with any undue advantage over our own producers.

Years ago we had in our platform a provision that in addition to that, there should be a fair profit for the American producer, but we yielded that, and all that we asked during the consideration of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was given to us by the same authorities and the same experts that supplied the evidence at the present time, and the only evidence that was given us by them and by the manufacturers was their submitted list of production costs here and in a foreign country. In case a particular duty is too high, provision is made under the so-called flexible tariff for its reduction. But they say that the flexible tariff was not used. The fact that it was not used was a tribute to its efficacy. The opportunity was there for domestic manufacturers and importers to question the appraisement and the rates. All they had to do was to apply for a Tariff Commission investigation. A House Member could offer a resolution, a Senate Member could offer a resolution for that purpose, and because it was not used they said it was not effective.

That is not so. To my mind the fact that it was not used very often, or that there were not many cases litigated under that clause, is in a sense a tribute to the fairly good judgment of the committee that wrote the bill. You remember that in the tax bill we had section 220. It was calculated to put a heavy penalty on those who did not make proper distribution of their profits, and it was argued that because section 220 had brought in so little money it was not efficacious, it was weak. In my estimation the very fact that it brought in so little money was that that 220 was a warning to big business and corporations, and resulted in very few cases developing that had to be litigated in the tax courts of the Government.

Even if the present trade treaties were entirely wiped out and the rates of the Hawley-Smoot Act were restored, this would by no means result in any embargoes.

In both the Hawley-Smoot Act and the previous Republican tariff measure, two-thirds of our imports came in free of duty. If any evidence is needed of the fact that the rates imposed under the 1930 tariff have not shut out imports, it is found in the official statistics of the Department of Commerce showing large increases of imports of items on the dutiable list, even excluding those on which concessions have been made under trade treaties.

The Hull trade agreements have made radical and sweeping tariff reductions which donate to 64 countries special advantages in the American market.

Duties have been reduced on more than one-third of all commodities produced by American farmers and industrial workers.

When the producers of other countries are transferred from war and war industry to peacetime production, this open door to the American market will spell disaster to this country.

Eighty million men are engaged in war and war industry in foreign countries, according to Secretary Hull. They are not producing great surpluses of peacetime goods, although

American farmers and workers are already feeling the injury of competition by foreigners in this market. Imports are rapidly increasing.

The 80,000,000 men now engaged in war and war work will find it easy to compete with Americans. Foreign wages are lower. Few countries protect their workers by wage-hour laws, social security, workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation and other requirements that add to American production costs.

I do not know whether it is a new deal or not. As I look back at that tariff recommendation of the Honorable John Sharp Williams, and realizing that our distinguished Secretary of State belonged also to that same school of thought, it looks to me like an old deal with New Deal Santa Claus whiskers, and a full pack of gifts for our so-called good neighbors.

If the present system of trade agreements is continued it means good-bye to American control of the American market, upon which 95 percent of the country's business depends.

By transferring its tariff-making power to New Deal bureaucrats, Congress has made itself powerless to avert the disaster that is threatened. The tariff reductions under trade agreements tie the hands of Congress so long as these agreements remain in effect.

Not only are duties reduced on 1,063 competitive commodities, but pledges have been given that many articles on the free list shall not be made dutiable.

Experience warns us that the threat to American farmers and industrial workers is not an idle one. We can judge of what is to come by our experience after the World War.

Not less than 30,000,000 soldiers and war workers were turned back to peacetime production. At that time the United States had a low tariff. The war had acted as a barrier to the influx of goods into this country, just as the present war is holding back the ruinous competition that is in sight.

When the World War ended there was furious activity in foreign countries. Workers toiled 12 and 14 hours a day at poverty wages to restore the goods and wealth that had been consumed.

The surplus began to pour into the United States. Democratic low-tariff policy had opened the door.

In 1922 the Republican Party enacted the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act and again set up a Maginot line of economic defense for American farmers and American workers.

This country's market was saved for Americans. There followed 8 years of the greatest prosperity our country has ever known.

This was only 18 years ago. Yet the plain lesson of that experience means nothing to New Deal tariff theorists. Through bureaucratic trade agreements negotiated in secret they have traded away the substance of our American market for the shadow of foreign concessions.

We were unable to find out just who did sit in in the making of these trade agreements. We had a list published of Britishers that came here, but I have never been able to find out who they were; whether they were members of a British trade association, whether any of them were manufacturers, or to what organization they did belong; but it is significant that no American representatives of trade were permitted to sit in during the making of the agreements.

The concessions granted by foreign countries open only 22 markets on better terms to Americans. Other markets are mostly in minor unimportant trading countries. But the concessions in our markets are given away not only to the 22 trade-agreement countries but to all favored nations, numbering 64.

So the Hull agreements throw open our market to the whole world.

We are asked to extend this insane program for 3 years more, so that additional agreements may be made to tear away still more of our protection to American farmers and industrial workers.

This program is, in effect, a plan to merge all the world's markets into one pool. High-standard, high-wage countries are to come down to a lower level of living and wages, on the theory that half-starved millions of peasants and toilers in backward countries will get more. Then, according to this theory, the world will be happy and remain at peace.

It is a plan to create a vast pool of world poverty, into which the welfare of Americans will be thrown. Their market is to be shared by the low-wage workers of all lands.

This plan is a blow at the wage-hour law, the social-security program, and all other laws that have been enacted to benefit American workers and farmers. American wages must sink down to the world level.

I am not willing to subject our national welfare to the vagaries of theorists who think that world peace can be maintained by pooling the world's markets and the world's wages. I want the American market saved for Americans. I want Americans to receive high wages. I want farmers to receive their full share of income.

By holding our own market for ourselves we can face the world in safety. With that immense resource at our command we can go out and get our share of world trade. Without it, our foreign trade would be nothing. When we give away our market we give away the wages of our workers and the living of our farmers.

Congress should resume its power to control tariffs. It must act before the deluge comes. Will Rogers was eternally right when he said that "We never lost a war and never won a conference." [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

During the course of this debate the membership of the House is going to hear much about the iniquities of the Hawley-Smoot law. Our political and economic ills will be laid at its door. So will the wars being fought in Europe and Asia be charged to it, and we need not be surprised if the droughts of 1934-35 were due to that measure. However, we will not be told why the new dealers have been afraid to repeal it after 7 long years.

PRESSURE AND LOGROLLING

I cannot recall in the nearly quarter of a century of my service here when there has been so much pressure and logrolling as there has been in connection with this legislation. They even brought our Ambassador to Belgium back to act as liaison officer between the White House, the State Department, and the Congress. Evidently he was not on the job the other day. I hold in my hand a clipping from West Palm Beach, Fla., dated February 17. It reads:

PERHAPS SECRETARY HULL WISHES MR. DAVIES REALLY WAS MAGICIAN

PALM BEACH, FLA., February 17.—This swanky winter resort was chuckling today over an episode in which the fancy clothes of Joseph E. Davies, special adviser in the Department of State and former American Ambassador to Russia and Belgium, almost cost him his seat at the speakers' table at a Democratic rally.

So you have started to rally? Well, it is high time. [Laughter.] Reading on—

Davies arrived at the dinner last night in a top hat and silk-lined opera cape.

Attendants at the door, after one peek at the silk skimmer and cape, mistook Davies for a magician slated to appear later, and were trying to shunt him off to the stage door when someone recognized Secretary of State Hull's new man Friday.

Undoubtedly, the gathering was looking for a magician who could pull another white rabbit out of the hat.

At the outset be it understood that those who oppose the joint resolution to extend the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act for another 3 years do so because it is not reciprocity.

In their zeal to cultivate international goodwill the new dealers have given away the cream of the American market, especially as it affects agriculture. We protest against the manner in which the law has been and is being administered. It savors of bureaucracy in its most vicious form. Those actually charged with writing the trade treaties work behind closed doors; their identity is unknown to those whose fortunes and future rest in their hands. From their handiwork there is no appeal. They are judge and jury. Incidentally,

they are free-traders who believe that the more we buy from other nations the more friendly will those countries feel toward us, thus correspondingly lessening the chances for war.

We object to the policy now in effect which gives to all countries, save Germany and Australia, all the benefits that we give to the country with which we enter into an agreement, even though such countries give us no concessions in return. This is done under the so-called favored-nation clause. Russia and Japan have benefited greatly under this strange and indefensible arrangement. Our colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] has explained the way it works in an understandable manner. I shall at this point use his illustration: "If two neighbors trade horses, the one who is in the same fix as is Uncle Sam will have to give a horse gratis to each of his other neighbors." Such an arrangement is unsound and dangerous. Likewise, it is indefensible.

All trade agreements should be upon a barter basis. We have an agreement with Brazil. Last year the Brazilians bought from us commodities valued at \$80,000,000, while in turn we bought \$107,000,000 from her. Why should not Brazil be required to buy as much from us as we buy from her? No, they tell us that would not be neighborly. Maybe not, but it would be smart business. It will be recalled that George N. Peek, as good a friend as the American farmer has ever had, broke with the New Deal because of their refusal to view foreign trade in a practical manner. Mr. Peek contends that nearly all the treaties made to date have been made at the expense of the American farmer. The testimony of Louis J. Taber, master of the National Grange; F. E. Mollin, secretary, American National Live Stock Association; Charles W. Holman, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation; J. H. Connaughton, National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers; Dr. John Lee Coulter, a recognized economist against whom the new dealers brought their heaviest artillery without avail—one and all were of one mind. The reciprocal-trade policy of this administration had injured American agriculture. On the other hand, we had before us a number of witnesses, representing the automotive, office equipment, and other industries, in support of the program. I might at this point also call attention to the several representatives of women's organizations who spoke in support of the pending measure. Naturally so, for they represent the consuming elements of our people and probably can see no injustice in making the American farmer furnish their tables with food at below cost of production. Some apparently overlook the fact there can be no recovery in the towns and cities until agriculture has been rehabilitated.

Mr. Chairman, this is a practical matter, and each side views the subject in a practical manner. For instance, some 12 or 15 Members of the Houses appeared before us in the closing days of the hearings. One Member from Oklahoma, who came before us in support of the resolution, assured the committee that so far as agriculture and the livestock industry is concerned his people have no complaint. I was not in the least surprised to learn a few days later that this particular Member had but a few weeks previously bought nearly 1,500 head of large steers in Mexico for his ranch in Oklahoma. It is easy to understand why this gentleman is strongly in favor of keeping the bars down on cattle coming in from Canada and Mexico. Indeed, it would be strange if he took any other position, but we know that those who actually raise cattle for the market do not share his views nor approve the position he takes. Incidentally, this gentleman did protest the reduction of 50 percent in the excise tax on imported oil, so we may assume there are a few oil wells and few cattle in the gentleman's district.

Then there were several Members of Congress from Texas who came to plead that the excise tax on oil be restored. Like their colleague from Oklahoma, they were strong for the New Deal trade program, providing it did not do anything to their districts. Regardless of whether the oil tax is restored, these gentlemen and a hundred or more similarly situated will vote to extend the law for another 3 years because they know that the President yet has about 5,000 fat Government jobs to

give out and friends must be taken care of no matter at whose cost. To them the tariff is a local issue and "pork" is money spent for public improvements in some other Member's district.

The hearings disclosed some very interesting incidents. For instance, it was brought out that during the hearings on the Argentina agreement, in which it was proposed to make a substantial cut in the import duty on turkeys, one member of the Ways and the Means Committee, and a strong and lusty supporter of the Roosevelt-Hull free-trade policy, hot-footed it down to the State Department to protest that turkeys must not be touched. In checking up on the imports of turkeys, I find that they are less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent, yet that member throughout the hearings sought to console witnesses appearing in opposition that where imports are less than 10 percent they have nothing to fear.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. The Mexican cattle, however, paid full duty, did they not?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think not.

Mr. BUCK. Are you sure they came in without payment of duty?

Mr. KNUTSON. They paid the lowered rate. I cannot conceive of the gentleman going to Mexico to buy cattle when he can buy them here unless he could buy them cheaper. Of course, he gets more horns down there. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my friend.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mexican currency has depreciated 41 percent. Consequently the American dollar will buy 41 percent more than theirs, even though we do not have a lower duty.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank my colleague from Minnesota, who is an outstanding authority on finance. I had overlooked that point.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is there a trade agreement with Mexico?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mexico does not need to enter into a trade agreement with us. She gets the cream without giving us anything in return. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman is well aware of the fact that there is not a single man in this House, or a married man either, for that matter, who speaks for the southwestern cattle and mohair industries who will stand here and defend this program in the name of those growers of cattle and mohair.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the gentleman is right. Certainly no one in possession of his senses will do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I make this statement now to give the Texas delegation, or any Member who represents that part of the State, a chance to defend the program.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am coming to the Texas delegation a little later.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. It is a fact, however, that cattle are bringing a substantially higher price today than they did in 1932 or 1933 or for several years before?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I will agree to that, but that is because world conditions have changed since that time.

Mr. SOUTH. It is further a fact, is it not—

Mr. KNUTSON. I want to go back to my friend from Oklahoma now. I will get to Texas in a few minutes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there for a moment?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact also that we have 8,000,000 less cattle than we had in 1934?

Mr. KNUTSON. It was so testified to before the committee.

How different the attitude of the Florida delegation. The agreement with Cuba has greatly injured the early vegetable grower in that and other Southern States. He is being put out of business by peon labor in Cuba whose only wearing apparel is a breechclout and a tattered straw hat. I take off my hat to the Florida delegation. They opposed and voted against the original Reciprocal Trade Act and have consistently opposed it ever since. They know what it has done and is doing to their people. Let me suggest that the Members read the able statement of Representative PAR CANNON on the subject of early vegetables, to be found on page 2619 of the printed hearings. It is entirely free from that narrow local view so often found.

In passing let me say that service on the Ways and Means Committee is a course in human psychology such as can be had in no college or school. It brings out in burning letters human provincialism and selfishness, ambition, and avarice. What I say does not apply to those who fight for the right to enjoy American standards of living nor those who insist that all tariff duties levied shall be sufficiently high to equalize the cost of production here and abroad. Did they not raise their voice in protest against being put out of business by a trade policy conceived and nourished by a group of impractical visionaries who are in fact internationalists, they would be craven cowards unworthy of American citizenship.

It is not alone the farmer who opposes the surrender of the American market to the foreigner. The hearings disclose that organized labor, who are being displaced by the foreign workingman, often from the pauper oriental field, also bitterly oppose the policy now in force. I cite Matthew Woll, vice president, American Federation of Labor, and president of America's Wage Earners' Conference; James M. Duffy, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Very briefly.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman will concede that Matthew Woll, under cross-examination, admitted that he was not speaking for the American labor movement.

Mr. KNUTSON. Matthew Woll stated that he was speaking for—

Mr. DINGELL. Matthew Woll.

Mr. KNUTSON. Wait a minute; for the American Wage Earners League.

Mr. DINGELL. That is not the American labor movement, I state to my friend.

Mr. KNUTSON. He voiced the feeling of a majority of the members of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. DINGELL. He was repudiated by the president of the American Federation of Labor as not speaking for the labor movement.

Mr. KNUTSON. As far as the president of the American Federation of Labor is concerned, he has been on both sides of this question.

Mr. DINGELL. If there is anyone who is spokesman for American labor, it is the president of the A. F. of L. and not Matthew Woll.

Mr. KNUTSON. I carry a card in the A. F. of L.

Mr. DINGELL. Is it in good standing?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; it is. I pay my dues.

Mr. DINGELL. All right; put it up.

Mr. KNUTSON. I try to set an example for the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I challenge the statement.

Mr. KNUTSON. Read their straightforward statements telling how the workingmen of America have been robbed of their jobs by foreign competitors. Mr. Woll's statement is to be found on pages 1366 to 1395. Incidentally, I commend a study of this able and patriotic document to those college professors who believe there should be no trade barriers between nations. Theirs is a fine theory, but it cannot be made workable until all people are on the same living

level. As we cannot draw the peasant, coolie, and peon up to our level, it follows that these intellectual oddities would have us descend to the lowest level now in force. Mr. Duffy's statement is to be found on pages 2136 to 2158. How any workingman, after reading statements such as these, can longer be a free trader is beyond me.

Mr. SOUTH. It is a fact, is it not, that the laboring man is receiving substantially more per hour and day now than he was in 1935 when the trade agreements were adopted?

Mr. KNUTSON. I have not gone into that phase of it.

Mr. SOUTH. I will say to the gentleman that it is a fact.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is usually correct. I have very high regard for the gentleman's intellectual honesty.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The pottery workers in Japan get 4 cents an hour. The pottery workers in the United States get 75 cents an hour. As a result Japan supplies our market with 60 percent of its pottery.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true; and it is equally true in many other lines.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield briefly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want the gentleman's views on a question which has troubled me somewhat, the favored-nation clause in many of our treaties. Assuming that this Government makes a reciprocal-trade agreement with Canada, we give Canada certain concessions and in return she gives us concessions, but I understand that under the favored-nation clause Mexico has as much right to claim those benefits as Canada.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What does the United States get for extending all those benefits to Mexico under the treaty with Canada?

Mr. KNUTSON. We got a thumbing of the nose and the confiscation of American property in return, may I say.

The hearings are replete with tables. In a study of such figures it is well to bear in mind that the comparisons in imports and exports are made on a valuation basis rather than quantitative. Let us take one typical case. In 1938 we exported 500,000 barrels of hydraulic cement valued at \$2.32 a barrel. During the same period we imported 1,750,000 barrels of hydraulic cement, upon which a valuation of 83 cents per barrel was placed.

So our imports seem small in comparison with our exports measured in dollars, but measured in the amount of product used the story is entirely different. Measured in dollars, 500 barrels at \$2.32 look as big, if not bigger than, 1,750,000 barrels at 83 cents.

Here is another glaring example: The first 11 months in 1939 we exported 7,576,391 metal filament light bulbs at an average value of 12 cents per bulb, and during the same period we imported 84,296,063 light bulbs on which an import value of only 8 mills each was placed.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; briefly.

Mr. JENSEN. Can the gentleman explain to the House or enlighten us on the amount of free imports into this country?

Mr. KNUTSON. On a dollar valuation basis 64 percent of our imports come in free of all duty.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman tell us whether there is a trade agreement with Japan?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think not.

Mr. DINGELL. We are discussing trade agreements, are we not?

Mr. KNUTSON. I understand that we are also discussing countries that are getting all the benefits of the trade agreements, but give us nothing in return.

Mr. DINGELL. I am afraid the gentleman did not understand.

Mr. KNUTSON. The value of imported products is fixed at point of origin, hence any dollar comparison made is absolutely worthless as an index.

When the trade-treaty program was first proposed back in 1934 we were assured that the American farmer would be the chief beneficiary under its operation. Perhaps some of the advocates will explain to us how it comes that agricultural exports have declined over \$104,000,000 while imports of competitive farm products have increased by \$68,000,000 during the time that the trade-treaty program has been in effect. It should not be necessary for me to call to their attention the fact that before the trade program went into effect our export trade had increased 32 percent, or at the rate of 16 percent per year, from the 1932 low, while under the operation of the trade act the average increase in export trade has been only 13 percent per year.

Let us see what some of these trade agreements have done to American agriculture and industries partially dependent thereon:

Exports and imports for 11 months, 1939, by groups

[Compiled by Syndicate Trade Press from monthly summary of Department of Commerce for November 1939]

	Exports	Imports
Group 00. Animal and animal products, edible.....	\$68,718,749	\$90,067,938
Group 0. Animal and animal products, inedible.....	40,093,141	135,240,206
Group 1. Vegetable food products and beverages.....	219,369,644	468,657,120
Group 2. Vegetable products, inedible, except fiber and wood.....	159,039,981	307,630,293
Group 3. Textile manufactures and fibers.....	301,336,273	322,204,519
Subtotal.....	788,557,788	1,313,800,136
Group 4. Wood and paper.....	90,404,268	236,023,031
Group 5. Nonmetallic minerals.....	459,576,149	124,697,910
Group 6. Metals and manufactures except machinery and vehicles.....	395,609,284	197,686,316
Group 7. Machinery and vehicles.....	790,278,512	14,017,813
Group 8. Chemicals and related products.....	145,155,632	72,716,346
Group 9. Miscellaneous.....	96,886,743	84,489,787
Total.....	2,706,468,376	2,043,431,339

NOTE.—Export values are based on actual selling price, including cost of packing cases and containers, with transportation costs to seaboard included. Import values are the declared values at ports of origin, including packing and incidentals preparatory to shipment to the United States.

WE IMPORT 500,000,000 POUNDS STARCH ANNUALLY

We have several large corn-processing concerns in the Middle West. In 1939 they turned 78,000,000 bushels of corn into starch. Seven thousand employees were required to handle this corn, each paid a minimum wage of \$5 per day. The mills burn a pound of coal for every pound of starch made, and trains and trains are needed to haul the corn to the mills, and the coal from the mines to the mills. In 1935 we negotiated a trade agreement with the Netherlands. That country owns the Dutch East Indies. From those islands there now pours in on us nearly 500,000,000 pounds of starch annually, all of it produced by workers who get 25 cents for a long day. As each 34-pound lot imported displaces a bushel of corn one can readily figure the heavy indemnity levied on the American farmer, railroader, and miner.

The case of sugar is equally tragic. In Minnesota we have two beet-sugar factories which have been greatly restricted in their production of sugar, notwithstanding that we consume three times as much sugar as we are allowed to produce. The result is that the sugar acreage we could produce and consume at home is now given over to the production of wheat, corn, potatoes, and other farm crops of which we have a surplus. That situation also holds good in many other States. In 1938 the consumption of sugar was six and one-quarter million tons. Of this amount 1,800,000 tons came from Cuba. For every 100,000-ton increase in American production of sugar 25,000 Americans will be given jobs.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is condemning the New Deal for taking care of their multimillionaire Wall Street satellites who are financially interested in the Cuban-sugar monopoly, such as Charles F. Taussig, at 111 Wall Street; Vincent Astor; and a host of others.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, the Cuban-sugar activities are largely controlled by the big international bankers of New York.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And they are also big cogs in the New Deal political machine.

Mr. KNUTSON. They are the ones who get the benefit of everything we have done for Cuba, so far as sugar is concerned.

Continuing, that means 450,000 idle Americans could be put to work if the beet and cane growers were given a fair chance at the home market. We are told that we must buy at least one-third of our sugar requirements from Cuba, because she is such a good customer of ours. Let us examine the record. In the period 1935 to 1938 Cuban exports to the United States were \$200,000,000 more than her imports. What kind of business is that?

This is another case of where we should go on a barter basis. That would be real reciprocity such as President McKinley advocated when he said:

The end in view is always to be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and cannot produce ourselves and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people but tend rather to increase their employment.

To that sort of reciprocity the Republican Party has been committed for 50 or more years. Our party has also contended for tariff rates that will give reasonable protection to the American farmer, workingman, miner, and manufacturer. It is a policy under which we have enjoyed our greatest periods of prosperity and development.

When appearing before our committee Secretary Wallace said that the foundation for the present war in Europe could be ascribed to the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Act, way back in 1922.

Secretary Hull thought that it was the Hawley-Smoot Act. Historians know that the Treaty of Versailles made this war inevitable. I do not agree with Secretaries Hull and Wallace that trade treaties make for peace. Assistant Secretary Grady told our committee that England, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and other European countries have had such treaties for many years and yet Europe has been a cockpit ever since I can recall. Mr. Hull assured our committee that his trade policy is necessary to the promotion of peace. The act was passed in 1934 and extended for 3 years in 1937. When the original act was passed the world was at peace. Since it has been in effect, Bolivia and Paraguay have had a bloody war; Italy went into Ethiopia and Albania; Japan has ravished China; England, France, and Germany are again at each other's throats. Germany has absorbed Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland; and Russia's bloody hands are slowly strangling brave and honorable Finland. So much for that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the close of the World War, when the Democratic Underwood tariff law was in effect, our markets were swamped with importations, especially of agricultural products. They were offered at any price in order to establish dollar credits in this country. To avert disaster it was necessary for Congress to pass the emergency tariff act which materially increased import duties. That law put a stop to the dumping.

Mr. SANDAGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly, to my good friend.

Mr. SANDAGER. The gentleman is broad-minded enough not to blame the trade agreement for that?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am simply citing this to show the absurdity of the New Deal contention that trade treaties make for peace.

Mr. BUCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly.

Mr. BUCK. Does the gentleman feel that the extension of the Trade Agreement Act will precipitate further wars?

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not think trade agreements have anything to do with it one way or the other.

Mr. BUCK. Why does the gentleman bring it up, then?

Mr. KNUTSON. I want to show how absurd the position of the two Secretaries is.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman does not interpret that to mean that it makes for peace all over the world, but rather between ourselves and other nations?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am merely stating what the Secretaries said—that it would promote better feeling and peace.

The same situation is going to present itself when the present wars terminate, but then we will find that our hands are tied with all these trade agreements in effect. What will then happen?

Let me read to you some very significant statements on that phase made in this House on Friday, February 2, by the gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CANNON, a Democrat, during the debate on the agricultural appropriation bill. These remarks are to be found on page 1022 of the RECORD.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] stated as follows:

The most serious condition that exists is the fact we are drifting straight toward the danger that followed the close of the last war. This war in Europe is going to end. That is not a matter of speculation. It is not a matter of doubt. This war is going to end. Every man on this floor remembers when the war ended in 1918. You saw wheat drop from \$2.40 to 35 cents. You saw cotton drop from 20 cents to 8 cents. You saw corn drop from \$1.50 to 10 cents. You saw hogs drop from \$18 to \$2. What precautions have you taken to avoid that situation at the end of this war? Have you done anything at all?

Are you depending on the present system? Do you not know that since September hogs have dropped from \$10 to \$5? You talk about this committee cutting the agricultural appropriation bill in half. Why, the bill has cut hogs in half. When hogs dropped from \$10 to \$5 did wages drop? Oh, no. Wages today are higher than they were in September. Did the price of farm machinery and fertilizer drop? Oh, no. Do you know that since the 1st day of January wheat has fallen 11 cents a bushel? What do you suppose fertilizer has done, the fertilizer that grows the wheat? Wheat has dropped, as I said, 11 cents, and the fertilizer that grows this wheat has gone up \$8.50.

What is the system doing for us? If this system is failing to maintain the farmer's prices, when we have subsidies running into the millions of dollars, when we have a war over on the other side, when we have a drought in a large part of the country, when hogs are falling 50 percent and wheat is falling off 11 cents a bushel, what do you suppose is going to happen when this war closes?

Mr. Chairman, if the Committee on Agriculture does not bring in a bill here and this do-nothing Congress adjourns and goes home, and the war closes, and farm prices go to perdition again, the farmers of this country will have a pitchfork under the coat-tails of a number of distinguished men who sat idly by and let it happen.

I will ask my good friend the Speaker what he expects to happen to the price of cotton and corn and hogs when the war ends. What does he suggest in that contingency? Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that when this war ends the situation will be worse than before, because in 1920 we lent the people in Europe \$10,000,000,000.

The prosperity we enjoyed following the war and the temporary stabilized price of farm products was due to the fact that we were consuming our own money. We lent that money to be spent in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, you can be very certain we are not going to lend them money this time. They will get no money from the United States. As a result there will be an immediate collapse of prices that will bring a terrific reaction on this country such as we have never seen before, not even in 1932. I plead with the Committee on Agriculture to at least meet and express some willingness to consider a bill. There are half a dozen measures offered—I do not know which is good and which is bad—but they ought at least to meet and consider a bill.

The new dealers take the position that Congress is not qualified to exercise its constitutional function of levying excise and tariff taxes. As Congress is now constituted that may be true, but it will not be true of future Congresses where Republicans predominate.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly.

Mr. PATRICK. I would like to know if the gentleman is taking the position that the trade agreements can be so ar-

ranged that the end of the war can be foreseen and any drop in prices forestalled.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman believe, with all these trade agreements in effect, when the war is over and the collapse comes, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] foresees, and as we all foresee, that our hands will be tied, we will not be free to pass an emergency tariff to keep this stuff from coming in and depressing domestic prices, because these 22 trade agreements have been extended to 64 other countries.

Mr. BUCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BUCK. Was there any item mentioned in the remarks by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] which has been affected by a trade agreement?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am merely bringing out the fact that when this war closes we will not be in a position to pass emergency tariff legislation to keep our market from being flooded by countries that are bankrupt and impoverished and who will want to establish dollar credit in this country.

Mr. BUCK. I understood what the gentleman stated, but if these items have not been affected by any trade agreement, what is there to prevent the Congress from legislating in the event that this dire catastrophe occurs?

Mr. KNUTSON. How can we possibly hope to legislate to keep our markets from being flooded with competitive products when our hands are tied by 22 trade treaties that have all the effect of law? Our only salvation lies in defeating the proposal to extend the Reciprocal Trade Act for another 3 years. If we do that, we will be free to act in any emergency that may arise.

Mr. BUCK. Are those items affected by trade agreements?

Mr. KNUTSON. What items?

Mr. BUCK. The ones referred to by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. KNUTSON. I am using them as illustrations.

Mr. BUCK. Why not use items affected by the trade agreements?

Mr. KNUTSON. Because everything will be affected. You can go right down the line from A to Z and everything will be affected adversely when this war is over.

Mr. BUCK. The use of the speech by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is just another red herring drawn across the trail.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, anyone who refuses to be a rubber stamp is a red herring, in the gentleman's eyes.

We were told times without number in the 1932 campaign that one of the first tasks that the Democrats would set themselves to in the event they were entrusted with the conduct of the Government, would be the repeal of the Hawley-Smoot Act. Up to date that promise has not been kept. Why? Did not Majority Leader Henry Rainey, late Speaker of the House, "let the cat out of the bag" when, during the course of the debate on the Collier bill in 1932, he said:

Lower this tariff drastically? You (Republicans) will not do it, and we (Democrats) dare not do it with conditions as they are. We do not want this market flooded with the products of cheap labor in other countries.

For years we were told that the United States was the highest protected country in the world. That statement was false and without the least foundation. In 1928, when the Fordney-McCumber law was in effect, the United States was No. 9 among nations in the ratio of duties to imports with 13.3 percent. The United Kingdom was No. 11 with 10.9 percent.

In 1934, when the Hawley-Smoot law was in effect and before it had been tampered with, we had dropped to eleventh place with the ratio standing at 18.4 percent, whereas the United Kingdom had advanced to sixth place with a ratio of 27 percent. In 1937, the United States was thirteenth

with a ratio of 15.6 percent, and the United Kingdom had advanced to fifth place with a ratio of 23 percent.

Now let us see what the picture is as it pertains to imports in relation to population. The customs duties collected per capita in United States dollars in 1937 gives \$22.84 to Great Britain as against \$3.56 for the United States. These figures knock into a cocked hat all contentions that the Hawley-Smoot Act was excessively high.

Why have not you new dealers kept your 1932 promises to repeal the Hawley-Smoot law? Simply because you did not dare do so. Had you kept your word, Roosevelt would have been a one-term-ite. So you proceed, through these trade agreements, to do piecemeal what you did not dare do openly and courageously. In the 22 treaties already made, you have lowered the rate on 1,012 items, of which 162 were strictly agricultural, many of the reductions by as much as 50 percent. How does that square with Mr. Roosevelt's promise made to the American farmer at Baltimore during the 1932 campaign when he said:

I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered.

In spite of that promise to the American farmer, Mr. Roosevelt has permitted the duty on 162 agricultural products to be lowered. Do you wonder that the farmers have lost confidence in him, if not their admiration for his melodious voice?

Let us see how that promise has been kept: In the Canadian trade treaty the rate on cattle weighing 700 pounds or more each was reduced from 3 cents per pound to 2 cents per pound; other cattle, from 2 cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound; swine, from 2 cents per pound to 1 cent per pound; pork, fresh or chilled, but not frozen, 2½ cents per pound to 1¼ cents per pound; bacon, hams, and shoulders, and other pork, 3¼ cents per pound to 2 cents per pound; whole milk, fresh or sour, 6½ cents per gallon to 3¼ cents per gallon; dried buttermilk, 3 cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound; eggs in the shell, from 10 cents per dozen to 5 cents per dozen; rye, 15 cents per bushel to 12 cents per bushel; potato starch, from 2½ cents per pound to 1¼ cents per pound; palm-kernel oil, from 1 cent to ½ cent per pound; Cheddar cheese, from 7 cents per pound to 5 cents per pound. The rates on other cheeses are correspondingly reduced. Do you wonder that the American farmer no longer has confidence in the promises of this administration?

The Roosevelt-Hull idea of reciprocity reminds me of the chef who prepared a big stew for some gathering—half rabbit and half horse, one of each.

If this law is going to be extended, we shall insist that it be amended to permit parties aggrieved to go into court for redress. This inalienable right is now denied them. We insist that hereafter no concessions be made on products we ourselves produce in abundance; that in future negotiations due consideration be given to domestic cost of production. We demand that henceforth all agreements be openly arrived at by responsible and known agents of the Federal Government who have practical knowledge of production costs and other essential qualifications. Finally, we demand that the Congress take back into its own hands the power to act upon trade treaties made in the future before they shall become operative, and that upon their expiration treaties now in effect be rewritten along these lines. [Applause.]

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, when a subject such as reciprocal-trade agreements has been before the Congress for 5 continuous years, it is futile to assume that votes can be changed by debate on the floor. But those who, like myself, have given much study to the program and have supported it because they sincerely believe it to be a method of promoting the national welfare welcome these periodic opportunities of publicly expressing the reasons for our support. In all frankness, I admit the majority report, filed with the resolution, covers the whole field and more ably than I could

individually do, but I find satisfaction in publicly expressing my approval of the program and in urging my colleagues in the House to support it.

On February 3, 1939, I addressed the House on this subject, entitling my remarks "Foreign Trade—the Road to Peace and Prosperity." At that time I pointed out that we were dealing with an economic and not a political issue and I urged the Congress to treat it as such. I still urge that viewpoint, although recent developments give me no encouragement to believe that my Republican colleagues in the House will treat this other than as a political issue. Only last Wednesday night my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], addressing an enthusiastic Republican rally in my district, outlined the five major plans of the Republican Party "to bring about the saving of America," number four of which was "Repeal the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, so that the influx of foreign imports of a competitive character may be stopped and our agriculture may have an opportunity to get back on its feet." But not all Republicans share that view, because the Republican nominee for the Vice Presidency in 1936, Col. Frank Knox,

I am going to talk very frankly about the tariff, because I believe it is one of the major subjects upon which the Republican Party must drastically change its traditional policy.

Next, let us explode the theory that one of the ways to help the farmer is to raise the tariff on farm products. The major products of American agriculture are wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and lard. Practically all of these products are produced by American farmers in excess of our domestic needs. Whenever this is true, the price of that commodity is fixed by world market conditions and cannot be controlled, except artificially, in this country. To attempt to help the farmer by promising him higher and higher tariffs on his products is naught but a red herring drawn across the trail to divert him from attack on the excessively high tariff rates on domestic manufactures. It is time that the farmer recognizes this for what it is. It is nothing less than an effort to keep him satisfied to pay tariff-created monopoly prices for everything he buys, and to continue to sell what he does produce at world prices. * * *

And the record of our committee hearings is filled with the comments of other distinguished Republicans to the same effect.

The tariff is undoubtedly an economic issue but lends itself to the uses of politicians because of the difficulty of the average man to understand the intricate principles of the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services.

The economist's voice is too often a lone one on the prairie of modern mercantilism. When he tries to reason beyond the "seen" into the "unseen" he is usually condemned by the so-called practical man as a theorist. But he continues to hope that some day his point of view will be accepted and that the country will cast aside its fallacies and adopt a consistent and reasonable commercial policy.

Most important among these fallacies in the field of international economics are: First, the undue emphasis upon money as a measure of national wealth; second, the attempts of the nations of the world to attain economic self-sufficiency; and third, the undue emphasis upon exports alone.

Economic activity has a purpose. That purpose is to produce goods and services and to put them into the hands of the people. Under our arrangements, this is accomplished by the profit system, in which money is, or should be, nothing said at Pierre, S. Dak., on January 12, 1939: more than the means to an end.

One of our twentieth century fallacies is that we place too much emphasis upon money, the means, and not enough upon the goods and services, the end. Money is a measure of wealth and is only of value as a medium by which goods and services can be obtained. We find ourselves applying to the national interest the same criteria that we erroneously apply to the individual. The more money an individual succeeds in accumulating, relative to his fellow men, the richer he is considered to be. But money is of value to the individual only because he can exchange it for things that he needs or wants. Gold cannot be eaten, as King Midas discovered to his sorrow. A man with all of the world's gold would be poor indeed unless he could exchange it for

the goods and services of others. And so it is with nations. National wealth consists of food for the people to eat, clothing for them to wear, shelter to protect them from the cold, medical services, and those luxuries that make for an abundant life. The wealth of a nation is not measured by the amount of gold that is amassed. All students of economics since Adam Smith published his masterpiece, *The Wealth of Nations*, in the same year that our forefathers signed the Declaration of Independence, are in agreement on this.

Still we persist in the old fallacies. We continue to think in terms of money measurement instead of in terms of goods. We prefer, through export subsidies, to give our goods away instead of using them. We stress money-making rather than economic welfare. We continue to encourage exports at the expense of imports, notwithstanding the fact that we emerged from the World War in 1918 as the largest creditor nation in the world.

THE SHACKLES OF ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY

No one would maintain that this Nation, with all of its abundant resources, its skilled engineers, and capable workers, would be better off if each of the 48 States set up prohibitive tariff walls against each other. This country is the largest free-trade area of the world. The regional specialization thereby made possible yields to us a per capita abundance of economic goods unequalled in the world's history. In fact, the cry today is that we must restrict production in order to make business profitable. How poverty-stricken our imaginations are when we maintain, with straight faces, that we have too much food, too many automobiles, and too many respectable houses.

Yet that is precisely what the nations of the world are doing. They are insulating themselves, economically, against each other and depriving themselves of the advantages of geographical specialization for the sake of making work for themselves. Nobody has yet suggested that in our public-works program we do away with shovels and provide the workers with teaspoons. But, would not that be logical if the policies that the nations of the world are following, and which our opponents seem to want us to adopt, are true; namely, that we live to work rather than work to live? Of what profit is it to France, for example, that imports of wheat are restricted when its people are forced to pay over \$2 a bushel for the wheat that they consume? Are the German people made wealthy by an embargo on imports which forces them to purchase costly and inefficient substitutes? Have the Italians added to their wealth by imposing prohibitive duties on goods which they are ill-equipped to produce? There can be no virtue in an economy of scarcity. We should, if we claim to be rational men, pursue policies that make for an economy of abundance.

NEED FOR LARGER, RATHER THAN SMALLER, FOREIGN TRADE

It is axiomatic that if a nation is to sell, it must buy. If we are to export we must import. This is an age of specialization and some of our most efficient and most important industries—including agriculture—are vitally dependent upon export outlets. As Secretary Wallace has pointed out, our exports of cotton alone have normally represented the product of over 50,000,000 acres of cropland. Our exports of lard, which in 1923 accounted for 54 percent of our domestic production, declined to 17 percent in 1937. Producers of fruits, grain, tobacco, automobiles, office appliances, and industrial and agricultural machinery are also vitally interested in exports. Cut off their foreign markets and you plunge them into depression.

Our economic life is completely intermeshed. When we introduce into any important segment of it, forces that operate to reduce markets, we start the vicious spiral of unemployment. Although it is true that the United States market is the largest and best market in the world, our economic life is keyed into that of the world and reacts directly to changes in world economic conditions. When the shoe manufacturers of New England, out of fear of a flood of imports, do

all they can to induce Congress to keep out the negligible imports of foreign-made shoes, they are encouraging those very forces that help to create their own economic difficulties. For, by encouraging the restriction of imports, they are helping to dry up the markets for those of our industries that are dependent upon exports. To put it briefly, it is vital to the shoe manufacturers of New England that the automobile workers of Michigan and the farmers of our great Mid-Western areas have the purchasing power with which to buy the output of their shoe factories. As pointed out in the majority report of the Ways and Means Committee, it is far better to enjoy a somewhat smaller percentage of a very large market than a larger percentage of a small market. Is it better to have 95 percent of something or 100 percent of nothing?

The arguments of the high protectionists, unfortunately, have a popular appeal because of the very use of the term "protective." That term appeals because it is not generally realized that the tariff is too frequently beneficial only to a particular producing group. But we in Congress who have the national welfare at heart, should confine ourselves to measures designed to promote the national welfare and not that of special interests. From the national point of view high tariffs are really restrictive tariffs and should be so called. For, in order to be protective to any particular group, a tariff must be restrictive of imports.

Advocates of restrictive tariffs frequently point to imports as the cause of business depressions. The truth of the matter is that imports provide a convenient scapegoat for our economic ills. Even the most casual comparison of domestic business activity and imports shows that there is a close correspondence between prosperity at home and the magnitude of our foreign trade. When times are good, both imports and exports are relatively large; when times are bad, both imports and exports are relatively small. I do not say that a large foreign trade is the cause, nor that it is the result, of enlarged domestic production. But, I do most emphatically say that healthy conditions at home and a substantial foreign trade go hand in hand.

The Republican opposition, in their attempt to minimize the repressive effects of the Smoot-Hawley Act, have given the impression that our foreign trade declined to no greater degree than did the foreign trade of other countries. But such a contention is not substantiated by the official statistics. The facts are that imports into the United States in 1932 were only 30 percent of what they had been in 1929; in all other countries—average of imports into 108 countries, excluding the United States—they were 40 percent. And, exports from the United States in 1932 were only 31 percent as large as in 1929, whereas exports from the other 108 countries were 40 percent as large.

There has also been an attempt to show that most of the decline in our imports in the depression period was occasioned by falling prices rather than by a decrease in physical volume. Again the facts are at variance with the argument of the opposition, for according to the index of physical volume of imports published regularly by the Department of Commerce, imports declined almost 40 percent between 1929 and 1932.

Restricting our foreign trade as a remedy for economic depression is analogous to resorting to exposure to a blizzard as a cure for pneumonia. The need in such times is not to restrict and reduce trade but to encourage it. Markets abroad mean markets at home. Together they mean jobs and improved national income.

TO ACCOMPLISH A LARGER FOREIGN TRADE, RECIPROCAL TARIFF REDUCTIONS ARE NECESSARY

Now I know the opposition will call all of this free-trade doctrine, and in a utopian world it would be an argument for just such a policy. But, in the world as it is, a world in which all countries are following mercantilistic gods, it is an argument for continuing a policy designed to remove excessive trade barriers. We do not advocate abolition of reasonable trade restrictions. The trade-agreements program,

in the hands of this, the most powerful country economically in the world, is the one rational program in a universe of destructive ideologies. The program is not a panacea for all the world's economic ills, but it is a force operating in the right direction. If we abandon our policy of trying to break the log-jam of unreasonably restrictive international trade barriers, what is there to prevent a return to brute force? Economic self-sufficiency is the signpost leading to just that! Restricting certain imports for the sake of stimulating infant industries is one thing; prohibiting all imports is another.

We all agree that foreign countries should lower their trade barriers for the benefit of our exports. Even our Republican opponents stress that! But, just how do they expect that to be accomplished if we are unwilling to scale down some of our own prohibitive trade barriers?

Until we emerged from the World War as the world's largest creditor nation it was logical for us to have a so-called favorable balance of trade. For in those days we were heavy borrowers abroad. In order to secure the necessary foreign exchange with which to pay our debts and debt charges it was necessary that we sell more than we bought. All of that, however, was changed by the World War. It then became necessary for us to develop an import balance if we were to collect not only the war debts but other debts as well. But, we chose—deliberately and foolishly—to restrict imports, while trying with might and main to develop our export markets. Instead of lowering our tariffs we raised them, first by the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921, later by the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922, and finally by the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930. Like the dope addict who finds that one dose of the life-numbing drug leads to another, we betrayed ourselves into believing that the way out of depression was to kill off our foreign trade by jacking trade barriers higher and higher.

Let us not be blind to the fact that the Smoot-Hawley Act did not initiate us into prohibitive tariffs. We were initiated in 1921, and took our higher degrees in 1922 and 1930. The minority members of our committee seem to delight in maintaining that the Smoot-Hawley Act did not stimulate retaliation against our trade by foreign countries. They apparently want to imply that the Smoot-Hawley Act was moderate, and in doing so they let the cat out of the bag. If foreign nations heightened their tariff walls against us prior to 1930, it was because many of our rates were already prohibitive as a result of the all-too-successful efforts of Messrs. Fordney and McCumber. The Smoot-Hawley rates, coming, as they did, after the depression began, operated to freeze still further the channels of trade. Ever since the war foreigners found it difficult to penetrate this market with their wares. The act of 1930 accelerated a movement that had already begun. In that respect we agree with our Republican opponents, but they refuse to admit the extent of the acceleration.

In his book entitled "Tariff Retaliation, Repercussions of the Hawley-Smoot Bill" Joseph M. Jones, Jr., states that—

National agitation in regard to a general tariff revision is a natural phenomenon in American history, but never has the United States in peacetime experienced such an extended and violent foreign reaction to any piece of local legislation as that attending the Tariff Act of 1930. The often-quoted formal and official protests of 33 foreign nations to the United States Government sink into insignificance beside the general protest and indignation of the populations of the principal trading nations of the world as expressed through an outraged press, mass meetings, and resolutions of trade, industrial, and labor organizations in the various countries.

His investigation, he writes, disclosed the effects of the Hawley-Smoot Act "as wide and profound, repercussions which impose urgent reflections upon our entire commercial policy." These repercussions he divides into three classes, from the immediate to the more remote, as follows:

Firstly, widespread retaliation and discrimination against American exports; secondly, very definite effects upon the commercial policies of the principal trading nations of the world and upon

the general development of the principles of commercial policy throughout the world; and, thirdly, as a result of the developments included in the first two classes, the fatal undermining of the principles upon which American tariff and commercial treaty making are based.

In its World Economic Survey, 1931-32, the Economic Intelligence Service of the League of Nations stated that—

The whole movement (toward higher tariffs) was undoubtedly accentuated both by the alarm and resentment felt in many countries as the discussions of the new Hawley-Smoot tariff dragged on in the United States Congress from May 1929 to June 1930, and by the real effects of that tariff when it went into operation. It was followed quickly by new tariffs in many other countries, among others Canada, Cuba, Mexico, France, Italy, Spain, Australia, New Zealand. In the case of the British Dominions, higher general tariffs were accompanied by an increased measure of imperial preference, and the general idea of a more extensive system of preferential duties with the British Empire was appreciably advanced.

The League of Nations World Economic Survey for 1932-33 referred to the Tariff Act of 1930 in the following terms:

The Hawley-Smoot tariff in the United States was the signal for an outburst of tariff-making activity in other countries, partly, at least, by way of reprisals. Extensive increases in duties were made almost immediately by Canada, Cuba, Mexico, France, Italy, Spain. During 1931 general tariff increases were announced by India, Peru, Argentina, Brazil, China, Italy, Lithuania.

Whether as reprisals against the Tariff Act of 1930 or as defensive measures for the purpose of safeguarding endangered currencies—threatened by the sudden curtailment of exports to the United States and continuing imports from, and debt payments to, the United States—the wave of foreign trade barriers which followed the enactment of the Tariff Act of 1930 clearly was caused in large part by the far-reaching effects of that law.

The new and higher rates of duty imposed under the Tariff Act of 1930 effectively cut down the volume and value of our imports of commodities from foreign countries and ipso facto reduced the purchasing power of foreigners for our export products. For this reason the Tariff Act of 1930 may be regarded as a wall which prevented the exportable products of our farms, mines, and factories from leaving the country for markets where they were desired, as well as a barrier against imports of foreign products. The foreign demand for many of our export products required more purchasing power than our dwindling imports of foreign commodities and gold imports could yield to foreigners.

Writing in 1933, Dr. Harold G. Moulton, of the Brookings Institution, summed up the effects of the Tariff Act of 1930 on United States export trade and on the commercial policies of foreign countries as follows:

This European movement (toward higher protection) was stimulated by the alarm and resentment felt in many countries over the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act in the United States, which, after a year of discussion, was finally passed in June 1930. This act was passed at a time when the balance of economic argument was overwhelmingly against higher tariffs, particularly in the United States; it was passed over the protest of many leaders of public opinion, businessmen and professional economists alike; it was passed despite the plain threat of retaliation by many other countries—passed on the assumption that we could simultaneously still further curtail our imports, collect our debts in dollars (earned by foreigners from sales in the United States), and expand our exports to foreign countries.

The results have been all that were anticipated by those who condemned the measure in advance.

Since 1930 foreign countries have done more than increase their tariffs. They have invented new devices to keep out imports. The very instruments of which the Republicans complain—exchange controls, quotas, and clearing and payments agreements—were inaugurated in part, at least, in retaliation against our own embargo policy. These types of import control began in 1931 or 1932, and now have spread throughout most of the civilized world.

There are at present only 5 European countries which do not have exchange restrictions; 12 Latin American countries have them, and so do a number of other important countries. All European countries, at least 5 countries of Latin America,

and Canada have clearing or payments agreements, or combinations of the two. Five European countries employ import quotas as an integral part of their protectionist policy. In most cases quotas were first introduced unilaterally, and later became the subject of bilateral negotiation in trade and clearing agreements. Frequently they are plainly retaliatory.

Yet, our opponents would have us abandon our efforts to break down these barriers by abandoning the trade-agreements program—the only effective method by which we may accomplish this essential objective. They talk as though we have been lowering our tariffs unilaterally since 1934, and they minimize the reciprocal nature of the agreements now in force. The concessions that we have obtained from foreign countries have been real and numerous, as shown clearly in the record of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION POLICY ESSENTIAL

Chief Justice Hughes, when he was Republican Secretary of State back in 1923, enunciated the unconditional most-favored-nation policy for the United States. It has not been, and in truth should not be, a partisan issue. The United States steadfastly has held throughout its history to a policy of nondiscrimination in its foreign trade. What our opponents fail to realize is that there is no difference between discriminations and preferential arrangements. A preferential agreement with a foreign country is a discrimination against other countries to the extent that they are interested in the commodities on which the preferences are granted. The only exception to our policy of nonpreferential agreements has been in our arrangement with Cuba, which is explained without difficulty by the geographic and historic position of that country.

If we should embark upon a program of preferential bilateral agreements, we would be waving discrimination in the faces of all other countries. It would be a clear invitation to immediate retaliation—a step which foreign countries are only too ready and too willing to take. Under the trade-agreements program we have but recently acquired most-favored-nation treatment from Canada, France, and other countries. All these advantages the opposition would throw away in exchange for a policy that has been tried and found wanting.

Our opponents claim that under the most-favored-nation policy we give something in exchange for nothing. That is not correct. By a careful selection of commodities, concessions are granted, in each trade agreement, only on those imported products of which the country in question is the principal supplier. The foreign country, in its turn, guarantees that our products shall receive most-favored-nation treatment in its market, and that if in a subsequent agreement with some third country, it grants further tariff concessions, we shall have automatically extended to our exports the same favorable treatment. Such a policy, even from the most selfish point of view, is just good common horse sense.

Some contend that because of our most-favored-nation policy, Japan—with whom we have no trade agreement—has shared unduly in the concessions that we have granted to other countries; this is not borne out by facts. Actually, less than 3 percent of the imports from Japan enter at rates of duty that have been lowered by trade agreements. Such arguments apparently are intended to scare and to confuse the uninformed; they appeal to fear rather than to reason and fact.

STATISTICAL RESULTS OF THE PROGRAM

We in this House could go on for hours trying to prove, or disprove, by bare statistics, that the trade-agreements program has been a success or a failure. All sorts of statistics appear in the record of the hearings on this resolution to extend the Trade Agreements Act. Some of the figures presented by those opposed to the program have been

juggled in such a way as to belittle the importance of the export concessions that have been obtained, and to exaggerate the importance of those that have been granted. I like to think of myself as a reasonably intelligent citizen, and I must confess that a simple, common-sense analysis of the official statistics leads me unhesitatingly to the conclusion that the agreements have been beneficial to the country.

But, before getting lost in a labyrinth of statistics, let us not lose sight of an important logical fact. Our technical experts and negotiators have worked hard—all of them—to try to scale down excessively high trade barriers. Now, would it not be strange if, in a period of economic recovery, imports and exports of those commodities that are still subject to substantial restrictions of one kind or another showed a markedly more rapid increase than those that are relatively free of restrictions? Let us not forget that under the terms of the Trade Agreements Act itself our tariff duties cannot be reduced by more than 50 percent. Moreover, in most cases reductions have been confined to those rates that have been relatively high. Why, then, should we expect that in a period of business expansion, imports of such commodities would increase much more rapidly than imports that are either free of duty or subject to only very low rates of duty? The fact that such raw materials as rubber and tin enter free of duty is a clear sign that we need them. Only necessities could ever have survived on the free list throughout the last three tariff-raising orgies of Congress. Therefore, it is only logical to expect that expanding industry at home will cause imports of these products to expand more rapidly than imports of products that are either more competitive with domestic production, or subject to high rates of duty.

Yet, in spite of this logic, which applies to exports as well as to imports, the statistical picture is extremely favorable to the program. If this is not a glowing tribute to the Yankee horse-trading sense of our negotiators, I do not know what is. It is a clear demonstration that the United States has not been "sold down the river."

I do not intend to present an elaborate statistical picture. But a recent release—January 13, 1940—by the United States Tariff Commission presents as unbiased and as clear a statistical picture as I have seen, and it shows that, speaking generally, our trade with countries with which we have negotiated trade agreements has increased substantially more rapidly than has our trade with all countries. The tabulation appears in the majority report, but I am submitting it for the RECORD because it impresses me as being about the clearest statistical summary that was presented to the committee. It shows the preagreement and postagreement trade of the United States with the principal countries with which trade agreements were made before 1937.

Agreements negotiated since then are still too recent to afford a statistical basis for comparison, and so are not included. For each of the trade-agreement countries a comparison is made between the trade of a period of at least 2 years preceding the date when the agreement went into effect and the trade during the entire period from that date through October 1939. The 10 countries covered by the tabulation accounted, in 1938, for 92 percent of the total exports from the United States to all countries with which trade agreements had been made before 1937, and for 90 percent of total imports from all such countries.

With the exception only of France and our imports from Brazil, the Netherlands, and Colombia, trade with all of the countries listed, both imports and exports, has increased more rapidly than has our trade with all countries. Furthermore, with the sole exception of Belgium, the figures show that our exports to trade-agreement countries have increased more rapidly than have our imports from those countries. Perhaps I should, in the light of this and for the sake of consistency, be critical of our negotiators for having bargained too well.

Preagreement and postagreement trade of United States with principal trade-agreement countries
[In millions of dollars]

Country	Periods compared		Annual average value of trade				Percent increase in United States trade with all countries
	Preagreement	Postagreement	Pre-agreement	Post-agreement	Increase		
					Amount	Percent	
Cuba:							
Exports to.....	January 1932 to August 1934.....	September 1934 to October 1939.....	30.6	73.5	42.9	140	60
Imports from.....			59.7	119.2	59.5	100	58
Belgium:							
Exports to.....	January 1933 to April 1935.....	May 1935 to October 1939.....	47.3	72.4	25.1	53	50
Imports from.....			26.1	67.0	40.9	157	47
Sweden:							
Exports to.....	January 1933 to July 1935.....	August 1935 to October 1939.....	27.8	62.7	34.9	125	52
Imports from.....			32.7	48.4	15.7	48	45
Canada:							
Exports to.....	1934 and 1935.....	January 1936 to October 1939.....	312.8	459.0	146.2	47	35
Imports from.....			259.0	341.1	82.1	32	31
Brazil:							
Exports to.....	do.....	do.....	42.0	62.3	20.3	48	35
Imports from.....			95.6	105.7	10.1	11	31
Netherlands:							
Exports to.....	do.....	do.....	50.0	82.8	32.8	66	35
Imports from.....			34.5	41.6	7.1	21	31
Netherlands East Indies:							
Exports to.....	do.....	do.....	10.5	24.6	14.1	134	35
Imports from.....			46.3	83.8	37.5	81	31
France:							
Exports to.....	January 1934 to June 1936.....	July 1936 to October 1939.....	115.2	151.4	36.2	31	38
Imports from.....			59.2	65.0	5.8	10	25
Colombia:							
Exports to.....	January 1934 to May 1936.....	June 1936 to October 1939.....	22.2	40.5	18.3	82	37
Imports from.....			47.3	48.7	1.4	3	26
Finland:							
Exports to.....	1934 to 1935.....	January 1937 to October 1939.....	6.5	12.7	6.2	95	38
Imports from.....			12.2	18.8	6.6	54	19

NOTE.—Includes all the principal trade-agreement countries except Switzerland and Netherlands West Indies. Export statistics of the United States show but a small fraction of the goods which actually go ultimately to Switzerland, the bulk of the export trade being conducted through third countries. Although the general provisions of the trade agreement with the Netherlands covered the Netherlands West Indies, it included no concessions on either side with respect to specific articles entering into the trade between those islands and the United States.

AGRICULTURE BENEFITED

But, this is not all. Official statistics also show that agriculture has benefited considerably from the program. Between 1935 and 1938 exports of agricultural products to trade-agreement countries increased 51 percent, whereas to all other countries they declined by about 2 percent. If cotton is eliminated from the picture, agricultural exports to trade-agreement countries increased 118 percent, and to non-trade agreement countries 47 percent. And, the decline in our exports of cotton cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be blamed on the trade-agreements program.

There is little reason for alarm because of agricultural imports when it is considered that only a small part of the imports of agricultural commodities are competitive with farm products grown in the United States. Six agricultural products not grown at all in this country; namely, rubber, coffee, cocoa beans, tea, and bananas, accounted for 45 percent of total agricultural imports in 1938. Noncompetitive agricultural imports that enter free of duty account for two-thirds of our total agricultural imports, and the remaining agricultural imports—those that are dutiable—amount to less than half of our agricultural exports. Even these imports of dutiable agricultural products have been occasioned, to a considerable extent in recent years, by droughts and crop shortages in the United States.

NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL CONCESSIONS IN COMPARISON WITH INDUSTRIAL CONCESSIONS

In an attempt to align agriculture against trade agreements, the opposition has stressed the number of concessions which have been made on agricultural products. They attempt to show that agriculture has been discriminated against in trade agreements by stating that the rates on from 150 to 200—Tariff Commission count, 161—agricultural products had been reduced. Anyone who has examined the record must know that many of the reductions, in effect, relate to border trade with Canada. The United States reduced the tariff on a number of Canadian imports and Canada in turn reduced the rates on our exports of similar products to that country.

Those same critics make no mention of the 800 or 900 reductions on other schedules of the Tariff Act, many of which were a positive benefit to farmers. More rates of duty were reduced in the metals and manufactures schedule—schedule 3 of the Tariff Act of 1930—alone than was the case

in the agricultural products and provisions—schedule 7 of the Tariff Act of 1930. There have been 226 reductions in the duty in the metals and manufactures schedule. I have not heard those claiming to represent agriculture mention anything about these reductions and the many other reductions in the other schedules of manufactured products, which reductions have been an aid to agriculture.

FRESH APPLES

In the valley of Virginia our chief export crop is fresh apples, amounting to about 15 percent of total production. For the Eastern States, including the big apple-producing States of New York and Pennsylvania, the average is about 12 percent. Without an export market every commercial orchardist in the East faces ruin.

The most important foreign apple markets are in Europe, where a large number of concessions have been obtained in recent trade agreements. The only concession on apples granted by the United States was in the Canadian agreement. Practically all of the negligible imports of the United States originate in Canada. The following Tariff Commission tables present the picture of exports and imports and the valuable concessions obtained in 17 trade agreements.

Apples, fresh

[1,000 bushels]

Year	United States commercial production	United States imports ¹	United States exports ¹
1923.....	109,922	131	12,295
1924.....	88,776	106	9,604
1925.....	101,080	74	11,015
1926.....	123,550	85	21,262
1927.....	79,254	155	9,430
1928.....	109,938	117	21,042
1929.....	89,270	312	10,273
1930.....	105,432	103	20,340
1931.....	113,207	82	18,030
1932.....	90,023	6	13,754
1933.....	81,925	13	12,261
1934.....	79,870	28	8,062
1935.....	103,749	5	12,239
1936.....	75,539	36	6,755
1937.....	115,733	5	10,958
1938.....	78,675	26	11,761

¹ Fiscal or crop years.

² Calendar year.

United States tariff history

Cents

Canadian trade agreements, effective Jan. 1, 1936, and Jan. 1, 1939, apples, green or ripe (per bushel of 50 pounds)-----	15
Act of 1930, par. 734 (per bushel of 50 pounds)-----	25
Act of 1922, par. 734 (per bushel of 50 pounds)-----	25
Act of 1921, par. 26 (per bushel)-----	30
Act of 1913, par. 217 (per bushel of 50 pounds)-----	10

Concessions obtained by the United States

Country	Kind of concession	Unit	Duty before agreement	Duty after agreement
Cuba-----	Duty bound (preference bound).	100 kilos, g. w.	1.20 pesos, 20 percent.	1.20 pesos, 20 percent.
Belgium: ¹ Apr. 1-Aug. 31. Sept. 1-Mar. 31.	Duty bound. do.	100 kilos. do.	25.00 francs. 28.75 francs.	25.00 francs. 28.75 francs.
Haiti-----	Duty reduced.	Net kilos.	0.10 gourde or 20 percent.	0.06 gourde or 20 percent.
Sweden: Feb. 1-Apr. 30. Jan. 1-Apr. 30. Mar. 1-Jan. 31. May 1-Dec. 31.	 do. do. do. do.	100 kilos. do. do. do.	10 crowns. do. 20 crowns. do.	10 crowns. do. 20 crowns. do.
Brazil-----	Bound free.	do.	Free.	Free.
Netherlands ² -----	Duty bound.	Ad valorem.	12 percent.	12 percent.
Netherlands Indies-----	do.	do.	30 percent.	30 percent.
Switzerland ¹ -----	Quota bound.	Quintals.	24.146.	24.146.
Honduras-----	Duty bound.	Gross kilo.	0.05 lempira.	0.05 lempira.
Guatemala-----	do.	do.	0.15 quetzal.	0.15 quetzal.
France-----	Supplemental quota.	Quintals.	None.	134.355.
Finland: Dec. 15-June 15.	Duty reduced.	Kilo.	6 marks or 3 marks.	1½ marks.
El Salvador-----	do.	100 gross kilos.	\$5.	\$2.50.
Venezuela-----	do.	Gross kilo.	1 bolivar.	0.075 bolivar.
Canada-----	do.	Ad valorem.	20 percent.	15 percent.
United Kingdom-----	do.	do.	25 percent.	3 shillings, 6 pence per hundred-weight.
Newfoundland-----	Bound.	do.	Free.	Free.

¹ Concession made on narrower classification.² Other concessions also obtained such as reduction of monopoly fees.

In addition to the concessions listed above a large number of concessions were obtained on apples in other forms (dried, preserved, canned, or otherwise processed); a number of concessions were obtained on fruits in general which includes apples; and a number of concessions were obtained from the various British colonies which are not here listed.

FARMERS AS CONSUMERS

In addition to the gains to farmers as producers in expanding both the domestic and foreign markets for his products, they gain as consumers. The main purpose of a program of lowering tariffs is to encourage trade to follow broad lines of economic advantage so that there will be more goods and services available to all. Trade concessions are important in bringing industrial prices more nearly in line with farm prices. It is difficult to say how much the concessions we have granted on industrial products in trade agreements have influenced the breaking up of rigid prices of industrial products. Surely the 800 or 900 rates on industrial products which have been reduced have, at least, prevented some prices from getting further out of line.

According to the Tariff Commission the average reduction in agricultural products was 11 percent in total dutiable imports of this whole schedule, which includes fish. This compares with the reduction of 25 percent in the metals and manufactures schedule, 27 percent in the wood and manufactures schedule, and 29 percent in the papers and books schedule.

Furthermore, the proportion subject to reduced rates in the agricultural schedule, including fish, was 28 percent. This compares to 61 percent for metals and manufactures, 74 percent for wood and manufactures, 92 percent for spirits, wines, and other beverages, and 61 percent for papers and books, clearly refuting the contention that agriculture has been singled out for discriminatory treatment. The farmer as a consumer of industrial products has definitely gained in the reduction of some of the prohibitory rates of the Hawley-Smoot tariff.

In the light of all of the facts, it is difficult for me to see how any Member of this Congress who has the economic welfare of the Nation at heart, can be opposed to the proposal that the Trade Agreements Act be extended for 3 more years. Partisanship has no place in the consideration of any measure which is so vital to the welfare of our country. I urge the passage of this resolution. I do not see how it is possible for anyone who has made an unbiased and intelligent study of the question to do otherwise. [Applause.]

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. I hope to continue this discussion for at least a few minutes without mentioning either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. I have prepared what I believe to be a statement of the effect of the reciprocal-trade treaties on agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of the United States are greatly concerned about their share of the foreign market. It is their contention that they are being outraded by the industrial sections of this country in the making of reciprocal-trade treaties. There is substantial evidence that this is the case, despite protestations from the Secretary of State and others engaged in negotiating trade treaties. The best evidence in this regard is the gradual reduction of agricultural exports and the increasing of industrial exports. In 1934, the first year of the reciprocal-trade treaties, agricultural exports totaled 32.1 percent of our entire export business. This has been gradually reduced until in 1939 agriculture's share of the export trade was only 21 percent. The purchasing power of the national farm income today is three-fourths of what it was in 1910 to 1914, when the farmer was able to exchange his commodity dollar for manufactured articles on a fairly even basis.

It is interesting to study the general trend of exports from the United States. In 1938 the total value of all exports was \$3,057,169,000. Of this amount, \$827,546,000, or 27.1 percent, was agricultural products, leaving the balance of \$2,229,623,000, or 72.9 percent, for nonagricultural or industrial exports. In the year 1939, ending December 31, we find that the total value of all exports equaled \$3,123,869,000. Of this amount, \$655,583,000, or 21 percent of the total, were agricultural exports, leaving the balance of \$2,468,286,000, or 79 percent, for nonagricultural or industrial exports. The industrial exports in 1939 increased \$238,663,000 over 1938, while the agricultural exports declined \$171,963,000 during the same period. The total agricultural exports would have been reduced another 10 percent had it not been for the subsidy or indemnity payment used to sell such commodities as wheat, wheat flour, cotton, tobacco, butter, nuts, and fruits in foreign countries. The value of these commodities exported by subsidy payments total well over \$65,000,000.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. Not now.

It was interesting to note that during the hearings on the extension of the reciprocal-trade agreements that the State Department opposed the export of farm commodities by subsidy payment. This is no doubt another reason why agriculture feels it is not receiving its proper consideration at the hands of those who are now negotiating the reciprocal-trade treaties. One hundred and eighteen million bushels of wheat of the 1938 crop were sold for export, largely through subsidy payments averaging 30 cents per bushel. Statistics furnished by the Department of Agriculture prove that the farmer benefited to the extent of about \$65,000,000 from this export, or, in other words, it meant an increase in price of about 20 cents per bushel. This increase in price was secured by a subsidy payment of \$26,000,000. I ask in all sincerity, What would have been the situation of the wheat farmer in the United States had it not been for this export subsidy? In view of this great benefit to the farmer, how can the Secretary of State and others engaged in negotiating reciprocal-trade treaties oppose the subsidizing of farm exports?

Agriculture in our war export trade—United States exports during the first 4 months of war in Europe, Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1939, compared with same 4 months of 1938

Export items	Pre-war September-December 1938	War period September-December 1939	Increase (+) decrease (-)
Total exports, all products.....	\$1,033,856,000	\$1,251,701,000	+\$217,845,000
Agricultural products (total).....	300,066,000	311,785,000	+11,719,000
Cotton, raw.....	87,358,000	155,475,000	+68,117,000
Tobacco, bright flue-cured.....	80,406,000	21,394,000	-59,012,000
Foodstuffs (total).....	122,303,000	113,157,000	-9,146,000
Wheat and wheat flour.....	17,076,000	12,916,000	-4,160,000
Corn.....	12,395,000	8,670,000	-3,725,000
Fruits, fresh.....	18,692,000	9,495,000	-9,197,000
Fruits, dried and canned.....	24,940,000	23,008,000	-1,934,000
Vegetables, canned.....	1,387,000	1,894,000	+507,000
Meats and lard.....	15,979,000	16,456,000	+477,000
Nonagricultural products (total).....	733,790,000	939,916,000	+206,126,000
Iron and steel—mill products.....	59,483,000	103,435,000	+43,952,000
Ferro-alloys.....	6,508,000	17,479,000	+10,971,000
Aluminum (except manufactures).....	2,414,000	10,987,000	+8,573,000
Copper, refined.....	28,165,000	35,073,000	+6,908,000
Machinery (total).....	151,962,000	172,245,000	+20,283,000
Electrical apparatus.....	34,302,000	38,213,000	+3,911,000
Metal working machinery.....	34,796,000	41,885,000	+7,089,000
Tractors and parts.....	14,110,000	15,348,000	+1,238,000
Aircraft, engines and parts.....	19,462,000	46,776,000	+27,314,000
Auto parts and accessories (total).....	86,090,000	76,116,000	-9,974,000
Motortrucks and busses.....	21,580,000	18,219,000	-3,361,000
Passenger cars.....	33,351,000	22,378,000	-10,973,000
Parts for assembly.....	14,471,000	16,329,000	+1,858,000
Petroleum and products.....	125,249,000	138,630,000	+13,381,000
Coal.....	19,556,000	30,852,000	+11,296,000
Industrial chemicals and specialties.....	19,697,000	34,590,000	+14,893,000
Sawmill products (lumber, etc.).....	12,735,000	13,145,000	+410,000
Leather and leather goods.....	6,955,000	9,228,000	+2,273,000
Automobile casings.....	4,248,000	7,200,000	+2,952,000

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. Not now. A comparison of the 4-month pre-war period, September to December 1938, in comparison with the war period of the same months during 1939 is most startling when it comes to the export of farm commodities. The farmers of the United States are going to pay a lot for the European war that is not our war. After the declaration of war England set aside all the concessions made in the reciprocal-trade agreements through quotas and the purchase of foodstuffs in other countries. This has resulted in an increase in the purchase of war supplies in the United States but a great decrease in the purchase of agricultural commodities. As a result of this there is great activity in certain industrial sections of the United States, but it is in reality only a temporary prosperity, and everyone knows there will be a serious deflation in these commodities when the war is over. The unfortunate part is that this industrial prosperity has created the impression that there is an increasing agricultural prosperity as a result of it. For the 4-month period, September 1 to December 31, 1939, there is a total gain of \$217,845,000 in total exports, or a gain of 21 percent, over the same period last year. Of this amount the agricultural products gained \$11,719,000, but a further analysis of the figures indicates that had it not been for greatly increased exports of cotton for war purposes, agricultural products would have shown a decline of \$56,398,000. Cotton exports for the 4-month period, September 1 to December 31, 1939, were valued at \$155,475,000 as compared to \$87,358,000 for the same period in 1938. Tobacco, fresh and dried fruits all suffered greatly reduced volume. During this 4-month war period we exported only \$21,394,000 worth of tobacco as compared to \$80,406,000 during the same period in 1938. This was a loss in export of \$59,012,000. Fresh fruit exports were reduced approximately 50 percent.

In the 4-month period in 1939 we exported fresh fruits valued at \$9,167,000 as compared to \$18,662,000 in 1938.

Agricultural exports, 4 months of war period, showing share of cotton and other products in total agricultural exports during pre-war and war period

Agricultural exports	Pre-war, September-December 1938	War period, September-December 1939	Change, 1939 from 1938	
			Amount	Per cent
Cotton.....	\$87,358,000	\$155,475,000	+\$68,117,000	+78.0
Other agricultural products.....	212,708,000	156,310,000	-56,398,000	-26.5
Total.....	300,066,000	311,785,000	+11,719,000	+3.9

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce figures.

Summary of exports, 4 months

	Pre-war period, September-December 1938	Per cent of total	War period, September-December 1939	Per cent of total	Increase, 1939 over 1938	
					Amount	Per cent
Total exports:						
Agricultural products.....	\$300,066,000	29.0	\$311,785,000	24.9	\$11,719,000	3.9
Nonagricultural products.....	733,790,000	71.0	939,916,000	75.1	206,126,000	28.1
All products.....	1,033,856,000	100.0	1,251,701,000	100.0	217,845,000	21.1

Summary of exports, 12 months

	12 months ending Dec. 31—				Change, 1939 from 1938
	1938		1939		
Total exports:					
Agricultural prod- ucts.....	\$827,546,000	Percent 27.1	\$655,583,000	Percent 21.0	—\$171,963,000
Nonagricultural products.....	2,229,623,000	72.9	2,468,286,000	79.0	+ 238,663,000
All products...	3,057,169,000	100.0	3,123,869,000	100.0	+66,700,000

The reciprocal trade agreement program is inconsistent with the farm program now being administered by the Department of Agriculture. Congress has enacted legislation which provides for parity payments for agricultural products and it is my firm opinion that we will not have national prosperity in this country until agriculture receives parity prices for its products, or a fair and just share of the national income. I do not see how it will be possible for agriculture to receive either of these under the reciprocal trade agreement program. The Department of Agriculture, through the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation, is engaged in the removal of surplus farm commodities while on the other hand the State Department, through the reciprocal-trade agreements, is reducing the import duties on the very commodities that the Department of Agriculture is distributing. During the fiscal years of 1938 and 1939 the Surplus Commodities Corporation purchased 20 different commodities and distributed them through the relief agencies of the United States. The total value of these commodities was \$30,479,112. During this same period there was imported into the United States \$92,298,000 worth of the same commodities. It is interesting to note that import duties were reduced on these very items through reciprocal-trade treaties. How can the farmer ever expect to secure parity under those conditions? I ask, How long should the Federal Treasury purchase these commodities by direct appropriation and then encourage their imports by trade treaties? Following is a table showing the amount of Federal surplus commodities and imports of the same for the fiscal years 1938 and 1939.

Purchase of selected agricultural commodities by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, and imports of those commodities, fiscal years 1938 and 1939

Commodity	Quantity purchased	Amount spent	Imports	
			Quantity	Value
Apples, fresh.....bushels	6,180,847	\$4,978,816	52,000	\$90,000
Beets.....pounds	17,858,256	149,383	1,000	(1)
Cabbage.....do	152,706,155	1,562,503	339,000	8,000
Carrots.....do	7,612,950	72,379	270,000	3,000
Cauliflower.....do	793,576	17,968	39,000	\$1,000
Celery.....do	20,391,300	381,384	96,000	3,000
Cheese.....do	3,445,500	478,211	110,167,000	23,584,000
Eggs.....dozens	11,319,300	2,255,659	551,000	106,000
Fish.....pounds	3,677,398	262,966	658,345,000	60,259,000
Grapefruit.....do	188,441,360	2,524,313	12,753,000	155,000
Grapes.....do	15,830,826	319,489	\$771,000	1,050,000
Milk, fluid.....gallons	18,440,847	4,229,949	22,000	5,000
Peas:				
Canned.....cases	864,192	1,427,780	\$1,610,000	165,000
Dried.....pounds	6,000,000	122,813	4,616,000	183,000
Fresh.....do	77,940	2,808	4,582,000	223,000
Potatoes, white.....bushels	6,570,548	4,286,457	\$1,697,100	1,444,000
Raisins.....pounds	50,199,000	2,137,251	825,000	92,000
Rice, milled.....do	85,948,000	2,861,207	\$137,024,000	2,294,000
Tomatoes, fresh.....do	20,741,815	465,259	120,692,000	2,633,000
Wheat cereal.....do	106,550,500	1,942,517	(1)	(1)
Total.....		30,479,112		92,298,000

¹ Not available.

² Jan. 1-June 30, 1939; not separately classified previously.

³ Cubic feet.

⁴ Pounds.

⁵ Includes seed potatoes.

⁶ Broken rice.

Source: Annual Reports of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. Fiscal years 1938 and 1939; Foreign Crops and Markets, Nov. 17, 1939.

The primary purpose of the original Trade Treaty Act was to seek and regain the markets for agricultural products and for industrial products as well. It is my contention that it has failed in the first and that the longer we continue it as it is being presently administered the more agriculture will suffer. At present our Nation has reciprocal-trade treaties with all of the leading industrial nations with which it has been possible to negotiate them, and this means that further negotiations must be held and further treaties must be made with nations which are in direct competition with the American farmer. This means that future treaties will further displace the American farmer's market. I think it is generally agreed that had it not been for the strenuous objections of the agricultural sections that we would today have a treaty with Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay. The State Department says that the negotiations with Argentina are terminated. Most of us believe they would not have been terminated except for extreme pressure from the farm sections. Therefore, is it not reasonable to presume that negotiations will be entered into if the trade-treaty extension is granted? Reports from Argentina indicated that they are expecting a revival of the negotiations at a near future date.

During the past 5 years 166 strictly farm tariffs have been reduced by as much as 50 percent. The farmers of this Nation should not be forced to meet the competition of cheap land and cheap labor by the importation of competitive farm products.

It is interesting to note that the President, during his 1932 campaign, made a statement to the farmers of the Nation, which they accepted as his attitude on tariff reductions for agriculture. His statement was:

I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered.

How can anyone justify the 166 reductions that have already been made when practically every agricultural commodity is below parity price and many of them only 50 to 60 percent of parity? The national farm organizations of the United States have made a thorough study of the trade-treaty program and are greatly concerned about its effect.

The National Grange, in its recent annual convention in Peoria, Ill., opposed extension of the Trade Treaty Act with the following resolution:

The reciprocal trade agreements program has caused serious damage to American agriculture. It has depressed farm prices by encouraging imports of competitive products from countries where substandard labor conditions prevail. It is wrong in principle and violates the Constitution. It should not be renewed when it expires by its own limitations on June 12, 1940.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. Not now.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, which has been reported as being in favor of continuance of the program, qualified their resolution in such a way that no trade agreements would be entered into with competitive farm commodities unless they were assured a parity price level. They further urged that the act be so amended as to provide that no agreement should be consummated unless it is unanimously approved by the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Agriculture. Evidently they believe, as most individual farmers believe, that agriculture has no friends in the State Department. How can they believe otherwise when the State Department opposes the payment of subsidy for the export of farm commodities? In my opinion this surplus crop removal program has given the farmer a greater direct benefit than any or all of the reciprocal-trade agreements. Following is the resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its annual convention in Chicago:

In giving our support to the continuance of reciprocal-trade agreements, we renew, with increased emphasis, our demand that no agreement be consummated, the effect of which might be to force or hold domestic prices for any farm commodity below parity level. Any other course would justify the condemnation of and opposition to such agreement by all agricultural groups.

We further insist that in the negotiation of trade agreements economic factors be given consideration equivalent to the weight accorded to the factors of diplomacy and statecraft. To this end we urge that the Reciprocal Trade Act be amended to provide that no agreement be consummated unless unanimously approved by the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Agriculture.

Before concluding I want to briefly discuss the peace aspects of the trade-treaty program and the farmer. There is no group of citizens in the United States that is more concerned about maintaining our peace and our neutrality than the farmer. His close touch with nature itself makes it natural for him to favor not only domestic harmony but also peace for the entire world. He is willing to sacrifice, if necessary, for this cause. On the other hand, I do not believe that he should be expected to pay the price that the trade-treaty program is exacting for an illusory peace. The trade treaty may have for its altruistic purpose the establishment of world peace through the reduction in trade tariffs. It may be a worthy purpose, but when we adopt it we must keep in mind that in so doing we must also accept the living conditions, wage standards, and competition of the peasants who produce competitive farm products. I for one do not believe it would justify the cost. Practically the entire world is embroiled in war, and most all of the late wars have been declared since the trade-treaty program was enacted in 1934. This is positive proof to me that we should not base our peace hopes on the trade-treaty program. We are dealing with the other nations of the world which are forced to adopt hard, realistic principles of trade, and I do not believe we can expect them to be swayed by gratuities in the form of tariff reductions. We are dealing with shrewd international traders and if we are not to lose our best market—namely, the American market—we must approach this subject from the same basis.

Mr. Chairman, I want to urge that no reduction be permitted on foreign farm products when the price of the competitive American product is below parity. Let us give the American farmer the benefit of the American market.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me for a moment or two?

Mr. DINGELL. Certainly.

Mr. BUCK. To correct the Record. I failed to obtain consent of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to make an interrogatory on the question of the purchase of Federal surplus commodity goods. He read a portion of the minority report in which he referred to a list of 20 commodities on which the tariffs had been reduced, amounting to \$30,000,000, while in the same period there were imported into the United States \$92,000,000 of those same commodities.

The question of purchases by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation is certainly one which demands more attention than the minority spent upon it, although they say that, "Perhaps the most preposterous conflict between the trade-treaty program and the farm program." The reason for the minority not continuing with the analysis of this question is undoubtedly due to the fact that their argument loses all its validity when the details are examined. Let us look at some of these details.

The minority states that—

During the fiscal years 1938 and 1939 there was spent on surplus removal operations in these commodities (20 commodities on which tariffs have been reduced under trade treaties) \$30,479,112, while during the same period there were imported into the United States \$92,298,000 worth of these same commodities from abroad. Presumably if the import duties on these commodities had not been reduced, a large part of the money spent out of the Treasury for surplus removal operations could have been saved.

Now, let us see what makes up these totals. Nearly eighty-four million, or over 90 percent of the ninety-two millions worth of imports, were of two items: Cheese, \$23,584,000, and fish, \$60,259,000. The Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation spent only \$741,177 on purchases of these two items. If there had been a complete embargo on fish and cheese, 90 percent of the imports of 20 commodities mentioned would have been kept out. Only 2.5 percent of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation purchases presumably would have been averted, although purchases of both products were due to temporary emergency conditions during the fiscal year 1937-38 and were not repeated in the fiscal year 1938-39.

Now, let us see what makes up the total of \$30,479,112 of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation purchases. The largest purchases were of apples \$4,978,816, white or Irish potatoes \$4,286,457, and fluid milk \$4,229,949, a total of \$13,495,222. Imports of these three products totaled only \$1,539,000, or a little over 10 percent of Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation purchases of them. But now for the joker: \$1,342,000 worth of the potato imports were of certified seed potatoes, and the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation bought no certified seed potatoes. Therefore, the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation expenditure of \$13,495,222 on apples, potatoes, and milk could not, by any stretch of the imagination, be reduced by more than \$197,000, or less than 1 percent, if imports of these three products had been kept out. Now, at the same time we were importing \$197,000 worth of these products we were exporting \$32,995,000 of them, or more than Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation's combined purchases of all 20 products. Surely the minority would grant that the trade-agreements program which seeks to safeguard in benefiting more than \$32,995,000 worth of our export trade in these three commodities was not greatly increasing the new surplus by allowing \$197,000 worth of imports to trickle in.

The only other commodities of which Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation purchases amounted to more than a million dollars are rice, wheat cereal, raisins, canned peas, grapefruit, cabbage, and eggs. Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation purchases of these seven commodities totaled \$14,147,465 in the 2 fiscal years. Imports amounted to only \$2,820,000, but exports, which were greater than imports for every one of these products, were more than twice as great as imports and Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation pur-

chases combined, being valued at \$38,802,000. Of the total of \$2,820,000 worth of these imports, broken rice accounted for \$2,294,000, or more than 80 percent. The only duty reduction on rice was that granted in the agreement with the Netherlands on finely screened broken rice, known as brewer's rice. It is but little used for human food. The rice purchased by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation could not have been substituted for the imported product on which a reduction in duty was granted except at a prohibitive price. The only concession on grapes was a binding of the duty on hothouse grapes, a luxury product. Canned peas also fall into the luxury category. The duty reduction on fresh grapefruit is limited to 2 months of the year before our marketing season begins, and the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation made no purchases during these months. Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation likewise made no purchases of wheat cereal of a type on which the duty reduction was made. The raisins on which a duty reduction was granted of a special type imported for the bakery industry. United States imports are insignificant when compared with exports or domestic production of raisins. In the 2 fiscal years 1938 and 1939 our exports were valued at more than \$15,000,000 while imports were valued at only \$92,000. Exports of eggs also greatly exceeded imports. No reductions were made on wool, corn, cotton, fresh beef, or wheat for human consumption.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I have a 40-minute speech to deliver in 30 minutes, I will not be able to yield until I shall have concluded my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I come from the great industrial and automobile-producing State of Michigan, and particularly because I reside in and represent a substantial district within the capital of the Nation's automobile industry, there will be very little surprise among the Members of the House when it is known that I am enthusiastically and wholeheartedly for the bill before the Committee, which provides for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I am not, however, provincial or chauvinistic enough to support the bill just because the administration proposes it or because the benefits affect alone the auto industry. If the benefits accruing to the auto industry were centered within and confined solely to manufacturers and workers engaged in the production of automobiles and to the exclusion from benefit of all others, or if such benefits were gained at the expense or sacrifice of the other industries and farmers, I could well find myself on the side of the opposition. The automobile industry is America's No. 1 industry. It is centered in the greatest and most intensely industrialized area in the world. At all times the production of automobiles is a gage of the prosperity of our Nation. In depression we all look to its early revival of activity leading to prosperity. In prosperous times we all look to it as a stimulant and stabilizer of our economy. This great industrial giant touches and affects everything and everybody. The products of the farm, the mine, mill, smelter, and manufacturer in every city, county, and State of the Union are dependent upon it for a very substantial outlet; nor are the producers of commodities alone the beneficiaries of automobile production. Finance, sales, and service business rises or falls with this industrial marvel.

I have repeatedly been reminded that the American farmer is the biggest proportionate buyer of the automobile output, and that is to be conceded without any argument from me; but I want to remind those who advance this line of reasoning in opposition to the extension of the trade agreements that the best customer of the American farmer is the worker in the great industrial producing centers of the Nation. And, taking the ratio of farm and urban population as a basis for the comparison as to who is the best customer for the other, we will find that the argument and comparison favors the urban customer in the ratio of about 3 to 1.

We are all of one mind in saying that the American market for the farmer and the industrial worker is the most important and the one to protect and enlarge upon, and that is what the administration is trying to do through trade agree-

ments. The farmer cares not if he sells his grain, hogs, cattle, beans, or furs as an export. What he wants to do is to sell his products to somebody. If an agreement can be made that will stimulate the automobile manufacturer and our industries to rise to great heights of production, the surplus of farm products will go into the stomachs of our factory workers, who will pay in hard, cold-rolled American dollars for what they buy. Our American workers are the best eaters—yes; by comparison they are the epicures among the workers of the world.

A splendid and well-qualified witness in the person of R. W. Gifford, chairman of the foreign trade committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce, appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and made a most powerful and lucid statement in behalf of the trade agreements. His testimony is not only forceful, but unimpeachable because of its thoroughness and fairness to all concerned. He treats and gives full consideration to the farmer equity in the proposed legislation. I refer you to his testimony on page 1534 of the printed hearings. It is well worth reading.

It is not my purpose to repeat again the overwhelming evidence presented at those hearings which reaffirm my belief in the desirability of continuing this legislation. Other members of this Committee already have reviewed the major features of the testimony and I will touch upon them only insofar as they bear upon the questions to which I address myself.

As pointed out by the spokesman for the Detroit Board of Commerce in the statement before the committee, probably

no area in the country has more real interest in the success of the trade-agreements program than Detroit and Michigan. That foreign trade is important to us is indicated by the fact that the Detroit industrial area is the largest producer of manufactured goods for exportation in the United States. According to testimony, about 800 plants in Michigan are engaged in exports. Six hundred of these plants are listed in the hearings. I will not bore you with the reading of this list, but I desire, nevertheless, to insert the names of these companies and their locations in the RECORD. I will also put into the RECORD three brief, though important, tables.

Foreign sales of American automobiles
[Number in thousands]

Year	United States exports ¹	Canadian production	Total
1926.....	393	205	598
1927.....	466	179	645
1928.....	583	242	825
1929.....	734	263	996
1930.....	406	153	559
1931.....	242	83	324
1932.....	120	61	181
1933.....	177	66	242
1934.....	311	117	427
1935.....	335	173	508
1936.....	346	162	508
1937.....	476	207	683
1938.....	326	166	492
1939 (January-October).....	258	120	378

¹ Includes foreign assemblies from parts produced in the United States.

Production and wholesale value of passenger cars and trucks (United States and Canada)

Year	Passenger cars				Trucks				Total passenger cars and trucks	
	Number (thousands)	Percent in United States	Total value (millions)	Average unit value	Number (thousands)	Percent in United States	Total value (millions)	Average unit value	Number (thousands)	Total value (millions)
1926.....	3,949	95.8	\$2,746	\$696	557	93.2	\$469	\$842	4,506	\$3,215
1927.....	3,083	95.3	2,266	735	497	93.4	435	875	3,580	2,701
1928.....	4,012	95.1	2,704	675	589	92.5	459	780	4,601	3,163
1929.....	4,795	95.8	2,981	622	827	92.8	596	721	5,622	3,577
1930.....	2,910	95.8	1,721	592	600	94.7	406	677	3,510	2,127
1931.....	2,038	96.8	1,154	567	434	96.0	273	629	2,472	1,427
1932.....	1,186	95.7	651	549	245	95.9	142	569	1,431	793
1933.....	1,627	96.7	795	488	359	96.6	192	536	1,986	987
1934.....	2,271	95.9	1,204	530	599	96.0	333	555	2,870	1,537
1935.....	3,388	96.0	1,789	528	732	94.9	399	545	4,120	2,188
1936.....	3,798	96.6	2,092	550	818	95.9	482	590	4,616	2,574
1937.....	4,069	96.2	2,398	589	948	94.3	573	605	5,016	2,971
1938.....	2,125	94.2	1,332	627	530	92.0	359	676	2,655	1,691

Chart showing that Michigan foreign trade goes hand in hand with farm income and industrial production

Year	Farm income ¹	Industrial production ²	Exports ³	Imports ³
1928.....	\$363,146,000	\$4,500,000,000	\$328,436,000	\$92,099,000
1929.....	245,963,000	4,656,718,046	342,646,000	105,449,000
1930.....	199,656,000	3,400,000,000	239,358,000	75,959,000
1931.....	150,885,000	2,551,257,763	144,869,000	56,832,000
1932.....	118,567,000	2,200,000,000	84,755,000	38,094,000
1933.....	134,612,000	2,104,104,542	82,058,000	40,537,000
1934.....	158,452,000	3,400,000,000	124,356,000	48,412,000
1935.....	185,620,000	3,986,178,348	129,243,000	54,054,000
1936.....	215,807,000	4,600,000,000	145,191,000	70,038,000
1937.....	238,252,000	5,296,100,960	190,223,000	86,238,000
1938.....	206,441,000	3,500,000,000	162,812,000	55,933,000

¹ Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture in cooperation with Michigan Department of Agriculture.

² Source: U. S. Census.

³ Source: Our World Trade, foreign commerce department, United States Chamber of Commerce.

⁴ Estimate.

Mr. GIFFORD. In addition to that chart, I have a list for the record, in case it may be questioned, of the 600 Michigan plants who are actively engaged in the export business, and incidentally I think that that can be increased another couple of hundred because they did not even have us on the list, and we have about five factories in the State of Michigan. So, judging from that fact, I think that there are probably many others.

Mr. COOPER. You can submit that also.
(The list is as follows:)

MICHIGAN EXPORTERS (EXCLUSIVE OF DETROIT)

Belding: Belding Hall Co., C. J. Graham, president.
Clio: Shetler-Calkins Co.

Adrian: Andrix Lock Nut Co., Inc.; Kewaunee Manufacturing Co.; Oliver Instrument Co.; Peerless Wire Fence Co., Sam A. King, superintendent; Schwarze Electric Co.; Simplex Paper Corporation; the Sunorback Co.

Albion: Union Steel Products Co.

Algonac: Chris Smith & Sons Boat Co.

Allegan: Blood Bros. Machine Co.

Alma: La France Republic Corporation; Republic Truck Co.

Almont: Hurd Lock & Manufacturing Co.

Ann Arbor: Economy Baler Manufacturing Co.; Hoover Steel Ball Co.; International Radio Corporation.

Battle Creek: Clark Truck Tractor Co.; A. B. Stone Co.; Advance-Rumely; American Steam Pump Co.; Battle Creek Biscuit Co.; Battle Creek Drugs, Inc.; Battle Creek Food Co.; Bennett Oven Co.; Duplex Press Co.; Globe Manufacturing Co.; Kellogg Co.; Nichols & Shepherd; Oliver Farm Equipment Co.; Sanitary Equipment Co.; H. B. Sherman Manufacturing Co.; V. C. Squire & Co.; Union Steam Pump Co.; United Steel & Wire Co.

Bay City: Aladdin Co.; Chas. M. Baumgarten; Bay City Boats; Bay City Foundry & Machine Co.; Bay City Shovels, Inc.; Columbia Sugar Co.; Dafe Boat & Motor Works; Evenknot Hosiery Co.; H. J. Hunt Showcase Co.; Industrial Brown Hoist Co.; Kneeland Bigelow & Co.; Kuhlman Electric Co.; Lewis Manufacturing Co.; Mohr Hardware & Furniture Co.; National Electric Welding Machine Co.

Benton Harbor: Michigan Power Shovel Co., Pier Equipment Manufacturing Co., F. P. Rosbach.

Big Rapids: Covell-Hanchett Co.

Boyer City: General Radio Therapy Laboratories, Inc.

Bridgman: Gast Manufacturing Co.

Bronson: L. A. Darling.

Cadillac: Acme Six Wheeler Co., Cadillac Malleable Iron Co.

Charlotte: Wilcox-Gay Corporation.

Coldwater: Regal Marine Engine Co.

Dearborn: Goldentone Radio Co.

Delray: Michigan Sprocket Chain Co., Solvay Process Co.

Dowagiac: Beckwith Co., James Heddons Sons, Round Oak Furnace Co.
 Eastlake: Rademacher Chemical Corporation.
 Eaton Rapids: Horner Bros. Woolen Mills.
 Escanaba: Kirstin Co.
 Evart: American Logging Tool Co.
 Ferndale: Excelda Manufacturing Co., Flint Automatic Heater Co., Palace Travel Coach Corporation.
 Fremont: Fremont Canning Co.
 Gladstone: Marble Arms & Manufacturing Co., Marble-Card Electric Co.

Grand Haven: Challenge Refrigerator Co., Eagle Ottawa Leather Co., William H. Keller, Oldberg Manufacturing Co.

Grand Rapids: Adjustable Table Co.; Alexander Sodds Co.; American Brass Goods Co.; American Seating Co.; Bissell Carpet Sweeper Co.; Blackmer Pump Co.; E. O. Bulman Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Carter Products Co.; Clipper Belt Lacer; Gandy Belting Co.; Grand Rapids Band Instrument Co.; Grand Rapids Loose Leaf Binder Co.; H. L. Hubbell; Irwin Seating Co.; Karl Manufacturing Co.; Klire Manufacturing Co.; Lightening Calculator Co.; Metygar Co., Inc.; Michigan Bumper Corporation; F. Ramville Co.; Rice Veneer Lumber Co.; Rose Patch & Label Co.; Simplex Brooder Stove Co.; Stichley Bros. Co.; The Tanglefoot Co.; Tannewitz Works, Voight Milling Co.; Weldon Manufacturing Co.; A. G. Woodman Co.; York Band Instrument Co.

Grayling: Kerry & Hanson Flooring Co.
 Greenville: Gordon Hutton Blast Grate Co.; Ranney Refrigerator Co.

Hastings: Hasting Manufacturing Co.; International Seal & Lock Co.

Highland: Liberty Fire Extinguisher Co.
 Hillsdale: F. W. Stock & Sons.
 Holland: Colorcrete Industries; W. E. Dunn Manufacturing Co.; Ottawa Hitch & Equipment Co.

Hudson: Hardie Manufacturing Co.
 Ionia: Ypsilanti Reed Furniture Co.
 Jackson: S. H. Camp & Co.; Foote & Jenks; Hinchley-Myers Co.; Isbell Seed Co.; Kelsey Hayes Wheel; Knickerbocker Co.; F. A. Luthy Co.; Niles Manufacturing Co.; Modern Machine Tool Co.; National Machine & Tool Co.; Sparks Withington Co.; Walcott Lathe Co.

Jonesville: Kiddie Brush & Toy Co.
 Kalamazoo: Allen Electric Co.; American Machine Co.; Atlas Press Co.; Bartlett Label Co.; Brundage Co.; Clarage Fan Co.; C. H. Sutton; Fuller & Sons Manufacturing Co.; General Gas Light Co.; Gibson, Inc.; Grace Corset Co.; Hammond Machinery Builders; Henderson Ames Co.; Humphrey Gas Heater Co.; Illinois Envelope Co.; Kalamazoo Loose Binder Co.; Kalamazoo Stove Co.; K. V. P. Co.; Paper Makers Chemical Corporation; Rex Paper Co.; Root & Spring Scraper; Saniwax Paper Co.; Shakespeare Co.; Star Brass Works; Sutherland Paper Co.; A. M. Todd Co.; United States Pressed Steel Co.; Upjohn Co.

Lansing: Atlas Drop Forge Co., John Bean Manufacturing Co., Duplex Truck Co., Gifford Engine Co., Hill Diesel Engine Co., Ideal Power Lawn Mower Co., Lansing Co., Novo Engine Co., Reo Motor Car Co.

Ludington: Electric Tamper & Equipment Co., Handy Things Manufacturing Co., Stearns Motor Manufacturing Co., Thompson Cabinet Co.

Manistee: Century Boat Co., A. D. Joslin Manufacturing Co.
 Marquette: Cliffs Dow Chemical Co., E. J. Longyear Co.
 Marshall: Shear Gillett Co.
 Mayville: Hardwood Products Co.

Menominee: Henes & Keller, Prescott Co., Signal Electric Manufacturing Co.

Midland: Dow Chemical Co.
 Monroe: Detroit Stoker Co., Greening Nursery Co., Monroe Auto Equipment Manufacturing Co.
 Mount Pleasant: American Enameled Products Co., Covered Wagon Co.

Muskegon: Alaska Refrigerator Co., Austin Machinery Co., Bennett Pump Corporation, Browne Morse Co., Chase-Hackley Piano Co., L. O. Gordon Manufacturing Co., Piston Ring Co., Sealed Power Corporation, Shaw-Walker Co., E. H. Sheldon & Co.

New Hudson: Vagabond Coach Manufacturing Co.
 Niles: Dry Kold Refrigerator Co., Michigan Wire Goods Co.
 Owosso: Owosso Manufacturing Co.

Paw Paw: Paw Paw Bait Co.
 Plymouth: Daisy Manufacturing Co., King Manufacturing Co.
 Port Austin: Maye Bros. Tool Mfg. Co.

Port Huron: Acheson Oildag Co., Auker Holth Co., Geo. C. Day Fish Bait Co., E. B. Mueller & Co., Port Huron Exylite Co., Robeson Preserve Co., Sterling Cable Corporation, Wolverine Shoe & Tanning Corporation.

Saginaw: American Cash Register Co., Baker Perking Mfg. Corporation, Brooks Boat Co., A. T. Ferrell & Co., Germain Mfg. Co., C. H. Hildebrand, Lufkin Rule Co., Wm. B. Mershon Co., Miles Machinery Co., Mitts & Merrill, Modart Corset Co., Nelson Bros. Co., Ruggles Motor Truck Co., U. S. Graphite Co., Wiches Bros., Geo. B. Wilcox.

South Haven: Everett Piano Co.
 Sparta: Sparta Foundry Co.
 St. Clair: Diamond Crystal Salt Co.

St. Joseph: Auto Specialties Manufacturing Co., Cooper Wells & Co.

Sturgis: Harter Rolled Metals Co., Harvey Paper Products Co., Kirsch Manufacturing Co.

Tecumseh: Republic Iron Works.
 Three Rivers: Armstrong Machine Works, Wells Manufacturing Co.

Traverse City: Acemline Manufacturing Co., Cherry Growers Packing Co., Potato Implement Co.
 Wells: Delta Chemical & Iron Co.
 Wheeler: Breckenridge Farmers Elevator Co.
 Wyandotte: Beals & Selkirk Trunk Co.
 Ypsilanti: A. J. Burbank & Sons, C. E. Thompson & Sons.
 Zelland: Herman Miller Furniture Co.

DETROIT EXPORTERS

A

Abrasive Engineering Co., 15947 Turner.
 A. C. Novelty Co., 6210 Second Avenue.
 Acme Manufacturing Co., 1645 Howard Street.
 Acme Mills Co., 5151 Loraine.
 Ainsworth Manufacturing Co., 256 Dubois Avenue.
 All Metal Products Co., Labadie and Second, Wyandotte, Mich.
 Allen Corporation, 9751 Erwin.
 Allen Industries, Inc., Leland & Grand Trunk Railroad.
 Allen, Mark W., & Co., 2119 Second Avenue.
 Aluminum Co. of America, 3311 Dunn Road.
 American Brake Materials Corporation, 4600 Merritt.
 American Brass Co., 174 South Clark.
 American Agricultural Chemical Co., post-office box 2458.
 American Carpet Co., 610 East Jefferson Avenue.
 American Electrical Heater Co., 6100 Cass Avenue.
 American Injector Co., 1481 Fourteenth Street.
 American Lady Corset Co., 1060 West Fort Street.
 American Oak Leather Co., 643 New Center Building.
 American Radiator Co., 1558 Trombley.
 American Store Equipment & Construction Corporation, 5235 Grand River Avenue.
 American Twist Drill Co., 14301 West Chicago Boulevard.
 Amplex Manufacturing Co., 6501 Harper.
 Anchor Steel & Conveyor Co., 2563 Bellevue.
 Anderson, O. L., Co., Inc., 1347 East Fort Street.
 Arrow Roofing & Sheet Metal Works, 5100 St. Jean.
 Artistic Furniture Co., 2000 East Atwater.
 Arvey Corporation, 6400 East Nevada.
 Associated Spring Co., 6400 Miller.
 Atlantic Sanitary Wiping Cloth Co., 1028 East Vernor Highway.
 Aulsbrook Co., 6400 Orleans.
 Automatic Products Co., 1145 West Grand Boulevard.

B

Barnes Scale Co., 6521 John R. Street.
 Barnum Bros. Fibre Co., Inc., 676 West Brand Boulevard.
 Beck, Koller & Co., Inc., 601 Woodward Heights Boulevard, Ferndale Station.
 Berry Bros., Inc., 211 Leib Street.
 Bowen Products Corporation, 2760 West Warren Avenue.
 Bower Roller Bearing, 3040 Hart.
 Buhl Stamping Co., 2730 Scotten Avenue.
 Bull Dog Electric Products Co., 7610 Joseph Campau.
 Bundy Tubing Co., 10951 Hern.
 Burroughs Adding Machine Co., 6071 Second Avenue.

C

Cadillac Motor Car Co., 2860 Clark Avenue.
 Calle Perfection Motor Co., 6240 Second Avenue.
 Capitol Brass Works, 2306 Franklin.
 Caramago, C., & Co., 1472 Adelaide Street.
 Carhartt Hamilton Overall Co., 1040 West Fort Street.
 Chamberlin Metal Weather Strip Co., 1254 LaBrosse.
 Champion Spark Plug Co., 8525 Butler Avenue, Hamtramck, Mich.
 Cherry-Burrell Corporation, 2016 Lafayette Boulevard.
 Chicago Rawhide Manufacturing Co., 9000 Alpine.
 Chrysler Export Corporation, 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Highland Park.

Clayton & Lambert Manufacturing Co., 11111 French Road.
 Colton, Arthur, Co., 2600 East Jefferson Avenue.
 Columbia Mills, Inc., 3297 Hubbard.
 Commercial Engineering Laboratory, 4612 Woodward Avenue.
 Commercial Milling Co., 323 East Atwater Street.
 Commonwealth Brass Corporation, 5835 Commonwealth.
 Consolidated Brass Co., 139 South Summit Street.
 Consumers Steel Products Corporation, 6450 East McNichols Road.
 Continental Motors Corporation, 1710 Ford Building.
 Continental Screen Co., 1323 Book Building.
 Continental Tool Works, 1220 Oakman Boulevard.
 Covered Wagon Co., 332 Cass, Mount Clemens, Mich.
 Copper & Brass Sales, Inc., 3246 East Woodbridge Street.
 Craine-Schrage Steel Co., 8701 Epworth Boulevard.
 Crawford Door Co., 5300 St. Jean.
 Crescent Brass & Pin Co., 5760 Trumbull Avenue.
 Cross Gear & Engine Co., 3250 Bellevue.
 Cummins-Moor Graphite Co., 1646 Green Avenue.

D

Daigle Iron Works, 1967 West Lafayette.
 Denton & Anderson Co., 2857 East Grand Boulevard.
 Detroit Aluminum & Brass Corporation, 3975 Christopher, Hamtramck, Mich.
 Detroit Brass & Malleable Works, 100 South Campbell.
 Detroit Belt Lacer Co., 3951 A Street.

Detroit Casket Co., 1401 Ash Street.
 Detroit Coll Co., 439 Fort Street.
 Detroit Container Corporation, 9119 Thaddeus.
 Detroit Electric Furnace Co., 825 West Elizabeth.
 Detroit Engineering & Machine Co., 4425 Cadillac.
 Detroit Gasket & Manufacturing Co., 12640 Burt Road.
 Detroit Gear & Machine Co., 670 East Woodbridge.
 Detroit Harvester Co., 5450 West Jefferson Avenue.
 Detroit Hoist & Machine Co., 8201 Morrow Avenue.
 Detroit Ice Machine Co., 2615 Twelfth Street.
 Detroit Knitting Mills, 1410 Gratiot Avenue.
 Detroit Lead Pipe Works, 14471 Livernois Avenue.
 Detroit Leather Works, 683 East Lafayette.
 Detroit Machine Tool Co., 5057 Woodward Avenue.
 Detroit Macold Corporation, 12340 Cloverdale.
 Detroit Michigan Stove Co., 6900 East Jefferson Avenue.
 Detroit Oak Belting Co., 3450 Wight Street.
 Detroit Packing Co., 1120 Springwells Avenue.
 Detroit Paper Products Co., 5800 Domine, Hamtramck, Mich.
 Detroit Refrigerator Co., 2030 Howard Street.
 Detroit Rex Products Co., 13005 Hillview Avenue.
 Detroit Rock Salt Co., 12841 Sanders.
 Detroit Saw & Tool Works, 528 East Fort Street.
 Detroit Screw Works, 1477 East Atwater Street.
 Detroit Sheet Metal Works, 1300 Oakman Boulevard.
 Detroit Showcase Co., 1670 West Fort Street.
 Detroit Seamless Steel Tubes Co., West Warren and Wyoming,
 Dearborn, Mich.

Detroit Soda Products Co., 35 George Street, Wyandotte, Mich.
 Detroit Stamping Co., 3445 West Fort Street.
 Detroit Star Grinding Wheel Co., 111 North Cavalry.
 Detroit Steel Casting Co., 4069 Michigan Avenue.
 Detroit Steel Corporation, 1025 South Oakwood.
 Detroit Steel Products Co., 2250 East Grand Boulevard.
 Detroit Suspender & Belt Co., 401 West Jefferson Avenue.
 Detroit Tool & Manufacturing Co., 1660 Beard.
 Detroit Trailer Co., 487 Beaufait.
 Detroit Torch & Manufacturing Co., 12057 Bardon, Highland
 Park, Mich.

Detroit Vapor Stove Co., 670 East Woodbridge.
 Detroit Waste Works, 7355 Bryden.
 Detroit Wax Paper Co., 1721 Pleasant, River Rouge, Mich.
 Detroit Corporation, 1501 Beard Avenue.
 Dibble Color Co., 1497 East Grand Boulevard.
 Ditzler Color Co., 8000 West Chicago Boulevard.
 Dockson, C. H., Co., 2885 East Grand Boulevard.
 Dodge, Horace E., Boat Works, Inc., 554 Lycaste Avenue.
 Donahue, F. J., Varnish Co., 10536 Knodell.
 Dongan Electric Manufacturing Co., 2987 Franklin.
 Dorr-Patterson Engineering, 3362 Wight.

Eaton Manufacturing Co., 9771 French Road.
 Edgar, W. H., & Son, Inc., 1924 West Lafayette.
 Electrical Refrigeration Co.
 Enness Co., 1521 St. Jean Avenue.
 Enterprise Foundry Co., 6463 East Warren Avenue.
 Essex Brass Corporation, 2000 Franklin.
 Essex Wire Corporation, 14310 Woodward Avenue.
 Everhot Heater Co., 5241 Wesson.
 Ex-Cell-O Corporation, 1200 Oakman Boulevard.

Falls Spring & Wire, 8635 Conant.
 Federal-Mogul Corporation, 11031 Shoemaker.
 Federated Metals Corporation, 11630 Russell Street.
 Ferro Stamping & Manufacturing Co., 1337 Franklin.
 Ferry-Morse Seed Co., post-office box 646.
 Finck, W. M., Co., 3708 Gratiot Avenue.
 Flex-O-Tube Co., 750 Fourteenth.
 Flint, Howard, Ink Co., 2546 Clark.
 Fitzsimons Manufacturing Co., 3104 East Woodbridge.
 Flintkote Co., 14201 Schaefer Highway.
 Ford Motor Co., Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.
 Frankel Bros., 1627 West Fort Street.
 Frazer Paint Co., 2475 Hubbard Street.
 Frigid Food Products, Inc., 1951 East Ferry Avenue.
 Fruehauf Trailer Co., 10940 Harper Avenue.

Gelatin Products Co., 620 East Hancock.
 Gemmer Manufacturing Co., 6400 Mount Elliott Avenue.
 General Cable Corporation, 1111 East Milwaukee.
 General Conveyors Corporation, 1938 East Franklin.
 General Hardwood Co., 7201 East McNichols Road.
 General Motors Overseas Operations, 4-235 General Motors Build-
 ing.

General Utilities Manufacturing Co., 2587 East Grand Boulevard.
 Gies Gear Co., 439 East Fort Street.
 Glenzer, J. C., Co., 6463 Epworth.
 Goldman, Harvey & Co., 9040 West Jefferson Avenue.
 Graham-Paige Motors Corporation, 8505 West Warren Avenue.
 Gray Marine Motor Co., 6910 East Lafayette.
 Great Lakes Bottle Cap Co., 2950 West Davison Avenue.
 Great Lakes Engineering Works, River Rouge, Mich.
 Great Lakes Foundry Sand Co., United Artists Building.
 Great Lakes Steel Corporation, Tecumseh Road, Ecorse, Mich.
 Great Lakes Thread Co., Wesson and Vigo Streets.
 Guardian Glass Co., Inc., 1734 West Lafayette.

H

Hall, C. M., Lamp Co., 1035 East Hancock.
 Hamburger, H. B., & Co., 4000 Beaufait.
 Hammond Standish Co., 2101 Twentieth Street.
 Handy Governor Corporation, 3925 West Fort Street.
 Hardie Manufacturing Co., 2009 Book Tower.
 Herron Zimmers Moulding Co., 3650 Beaufait.
 H. & H. Tube Manufacturing Co., 261 Scotten Avenue.
 Holley Carburetor Co., Vancouver Avenue and P. M. R. R.
 Hoskins Manufacturing Co., 4445 Lawton.
 Hostess Dairy Co., 14401 Dexter Boulevard.
 Hygeia Filter Co., 3422 Denton Avenue.
 Hygrade Food Products Corporation, 2801 Michigan Avenue.
 Hudson Motor Car Co., 12601 East Jefferson Avenue.
 Huron Portland Cement Co., 1325 Ford Building.

I

Industrial Chemical Products Co., 3777 Bellevue.
 Industrial Sheet Metal Works, Inc., 628 East Forest.
 Industrial Wire Cloth Products Corporation, Fourth and Brush,
 Wayne, Mich.
 International Machinery Co., 3131 East Jefferson Avenue.
 Iodent Chemical Co., Inc., 1535 Sixth.
 Ironrite Ironer Co., 38 Piquette.

J

Jackson Electrode Holder Co., 15122 Mack Avenue.
 James Motor Valve Co., 5450 West Jefferson Avenue.
 Jamieson, C. E., & Co., 1962 Trombly.
 Jenks & Muir, 6441 Hastings.

K

Kas'e Steel Corporation, 6782 Goldsmith Avenue.
 Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co., 3600 Military Avenue.
 Kendrick Manufacturing Co., 2724 Franklin.
 Kermath Manufacturing Co., 5890 Commonwealth.
 Kerr Dental Manufacturing Co., 6081 Twelfth Street.
 Kerr, Frank W., Co., 422 West Congress.
 Kerr Machinery Co., 608 Kerr Building.
 Knott & Garlus, 3945 A Street.
 Koebel Diamond Tool Co., 1200 Oakman Boulevard.
 Keen Manufacturing Co., Flat Rock, Mich.

L

La Choy Food Products, Inc., 8100 Schoolcraft.
 Lafer Bros., Inc., 1323 Broadway.
 Larowe Milling Co., post-office box 68, North End Station.
 Lederer Manufacturing Co., 3420 West Fort Street.
 Leibling Automotive Devices, Inc., 5725 Mount Elliott Avenue.
 LeRoy Broehm Foundry Co., Inc., 3126 East Jefferson Avenue.
 Lowenstein, S., & Son, 1945 Adelaide.
 Lynn Paper Products Manufacturing Co., 2000 Howard.
 Lockite Patch Co., 4196 Bellevue Avenue.
 Long Manufacturing Co., 12501 Dequindre.

M

McAler Manufacturing Co., 2431 Scotten.
 McCord Radiator & Manufacturing Co., 2537 East Grand Boulevard.
 McLouth Steel Corporation, 300 South Livernois.
 McNamara, Michael, Varnish Works, 3195 Bellevue.
 Machining & Grinding Co., of Detroit, 18102 Ryan Road.
 Magic Leather Treatment Co., 14118 Twelfth Street.
 Maid-Rite Garment Manufacturing Co., 511 Cass Avenue.
 Mallard, A. E., 3021 Wabash.
 Marshall Blow Pipe Co., 7431 Dubois.
 Master Woodworker Co., 138 Cadillac Square.
 Mechanical Handling Systems, Inc., 4600 Nancy.
 Michigan Bleach & Chemical Co., 1944 East Woodbridge.
 Michigan Brush Manufacturing Co., 7411 Central.
 Michigan Die Casting Co., 11831 Charlevoix.
 Michigan Smelting & Refining Co., 7885 Jos. Campau, Hamtramck,
 Mich.

Michigan Steel Casting Co., 1936 Guoin.
 Michigan Steel Tube Products Co., 9450 Buffalo Boulevard,
 Hamtramck, Mich.

Michigan Tank & Furnace Corporation, 14101 Prairie.
 Michigan Tool Co., 7171 East McNichols Road.
 Michigan Wire Cloth Co., 2100 Howard Street.
 Micromatic Home Corporation, 7401 Dubois.
 Midland Glue Products, 1478 Madison.
 Midland Steel Products Co., 6660 Mount Elliott.
 Mid-West Abrasive Co., 2189 Beaufait.
 Millers Peanut Products, Inc., 1990 Gratiot Avenue.
 Mitchell & Smith, Inc., 9469 Copland.
 Monarch Governor Co., 1832 West Bethune.
 Morse Chain Co., 7601 Central.
 Moto-Mower Co., 4600 Woodward Avenue.
 Modern Collet & Machine Co., 401 Sallette.
 Morris, E., Manufacturing Co., 1406 Gratiot Avenue.
 Motor Products Corporation, 11801 Mack Avenue.
 Motors Metal Manufacturing Co., 5936 Milford Avenue.
 Mulkey Salt Co., 1220 United Artists Building.
 Murchey Machine & Tool Co., 951 Porter.
 Murray Corporation of America, 7700 Russell Street.
 Murray, Edgar A., Co., 2703 Guoin.

N

Nash-Kelvinator Corporation, 14250 Plymouth Road.
 National Broach & Machine, 11455 Shoemaker.
 Nelson, Baker & Co., 1301 West Lafayette.

Newcomb-David Co., 5741 Russell.
New York Bed Spring Manufacturing Co., 638 Brady.
Norge Division, Borg-Warner Corporation, 670 East Woodbridge Street.

Northern Engineering Works, 2615 Atwater Street East.
North Wayne Tool Co., 6331 Tireman.
Norton Co., 5805 Lincoln Avenue.

O. & S. Bearing Co., 303 South Livernois.

Packard Motor Car Co., 1580 East Grand Boulevard.
Park Chemical Co., 8074 Military.
Parke-Davis & Co., box 119, Roosevelt Park Annex.
Parker Rust-Proof Co., 2177 East Milwaukee.
Parker-Wolverine Co., 5203 Martin.
Partlan, James W., 14290 Goddard.
Parts Manufacturing Co., 6901 East Lafayette.
Penberthy Injector Co., 1242 Holden.
Peninsular Metal Products Corporation, 6635 East Forest.
Phail, H. A., 10754 West Jefferson, River Rouge.
Preserve Surface Co., Inc., 6315 East Seven Mile Road.
Plymouth Tube Co., 1435 Franklin.
Preston, Horace G., 2581 Beecher Street.
Progress Bedding Co., 659 Winder.
Progressive Welder Co., 737 Piquette.

Ray Day Piston Corporation, 6656 Walton.
Republic Knitting Mills, 1907 Michigan Avenue.
Revere Copper & Brass Co., Inc., 5851 West Jefferson Avenue.
Rinshed-Mason Co., 5935 Milford.
Robbins Engineering Co., 635 Mount Elliott.
Roberts Brass Manufacturing Co., 5435 West Fort Street.
Ross Operating Valve Co., 6488 Epworth Boulevard.
Roman Cleanser Co., 2700 East McNichols Road.
Rotary Electric Steel, Eight Mile Road at Mound.
Royal Textile & Manufacturing Co., Inc., 690 East Congress.
Russell Wheel & Foundry Co., 8130 Joseph Campau.
Rycenga Manufacturing Co., 4091 Beaufait.

Schlieber Manufacturing Co., Inc., 11762 Cloverdale.
Schmidt, Carl E., 118 Leib Street.
Schmieg Sheet Metal Works, 320 Piquette.
Scripps Motor Co., 5817 Lincoln.
Sealed Power Corporation, 3-266 General Motors Building.
Seaman-Patrick Paper, 1225 Vermont.
Seely Manufacturing Co., 1800 East Jefferson Avenue.
Service Conveyor Co., 7764 Bryden.
Sevaerg Metals Corporation, 915 Harper Avenue.
Sharples Solvent Corporation, Wyandotte, Mich.
Shaw & Co., 1577 Ash.
Sherman Laboratories, 14600 East Jefferson Avenue.
Sherwood Brass Works, 6331 East Jefferson Avenue.
Shwayder Bros., Inc., 4270 High, Ecorse, Mich.
Solventol Chemical Products, Inc., 12001 East Jefferson Avenue.
Somers, H. J., 6063 Wabash.
Specialty Cabinet Co., 1103 Beaufait.
Sperber Manufacturing Co., 1815 Trombly.
Square D Co., 6060 Rivard.
Standard Computing Scale Co., 2461 East Grand Boulevard.
Standard Fuel Engineering Co., 667 South Post.
Standard Tube Co., 14520 Oakland, Highland Park, Mich.
Star-Service Hanger Co., 1605 Holbrook.
Stearns, Frederick & Co., 6533 East Jefferson Avenue.
Stecker Paper Box Co., 1420 West Fort Street.
Steel Materials Co., 17260 Gable.
Ster-L-Way Products Co., 2914 East Grand Boulevard.
Sterling Products Co., 2457 Woodward Avenue.
Stevens, F. B., Co., 510 Third Street.
Stinson Aircraft Corporation, Wayne, Mich.
Stott, David, Flour Mills, 4985 Grand River Avenue.
Stout Motor Car Co., 2124 South Telegraph Road, Dearborn.
Stroh Brewing Co., 909 East Elizabeth.
Sullivan Packing Co., 2801 Michigan Avenue.
Superior Machine & Engineering Co., 6425 Epworth.
Superior Safety Furnace Pipe Co., 5820 Forsythe.
Superior Seal & Stamp Co., 1401 Vermont.
Surplus Material & Machinery Co., 8735 Kercheval.
Swedish Crucible Co., Butler and G. T. R. R.
Swift Electric Welder Co., 6560 Epworth.
Swift Manufacturing Co., 247 McDougall.

Travel Car, 19400 West Eight Mile Road.
Taylor & Gashin, 3105 Beaufait.
Ternstedt Manufacturing Co., 6307 West Fort Street.
Tessmer Machine & Tool Co., 3337 St. Joseph.
Thorton Tandem Co., 5124 Braden Avenue.
Thompson Products, Inc., 7881 Conant.
Tisken Products, 8521 Livernois.
Tool Sales Co., 130 East Larned.
Traub Manufacturing Co., 1934 McGraw.
Triangle Manufacturing Co., 4045 Beaufait.

United States Radiator Corporation, post-office box 686.
United States Rubber Co., 6600 East Jefferson Avenue.

Udylite Co., 1651 East Grand Boulevard.
Universal Brewery Equipment Corporation, 3625 Superior.
Universal Cooler Corporation, Melville and Green.
Universal Fastener & Button Co., 2250 West Fort Street.

Valade Refrigerator Corporation, 6560 Mack.
Verner, James, Co., 239 Woodward Avenue.
Viking Sprinkler Co., 1125 East Milwaukee.

Walway Co., 19270 West Eight Mile Road.
Warner Aircraft Corporation, 20263 Hoover.
Warner-Wells.
Waterhouse Laundry Machine Co., 3322 West Fort Street.
Wayne Chemical Products Co., Copland and M. C. R. R.
Webb, Jervis B., Co., 9001 Alpine.
Wessels, D. C., & Sons, 1625 East Euclid.
Westcott Paper Products Co., 2526 Fifth.
Western Manufacturing Co., 3428 Union Guardian Building.
Western Paper Box Co., 1111 Bellevue.
Whitehead & Kales Co., 58 Haltiner, River Rouge, Mich.
Whitehead Stamping Co., 1661 West Lafayette.
Whitman & Barnes, Inc., 2108 West Fort Street.
Wiley Manufacturing Co., 4091 Beaufait.
Wing, J. T., & Co., 300 Bates.
Wittstock Bros. Co., 3117 East Warren.
Wolf Sanitary Wiping Cloth Co., 973 Madison Avenue.
Wolverine Aluminum, 1411 Central.
Wolverine Bedding Corporation, 3755 Beaubien.
Wolverine Porcelain Enameling Co., 3350 Scotten Avenue.
Wolverine Shingle & Lumber Co., 14930 Linwood.
Wolverine Tube Co., 1411 Central.
Wood, Gar, Industries, Inc., 7924 Riopelle.
Woodson, E. J., Co., 7415 St. Aubin.
Work-Organizer Specialties Co., 4042 West Jefferson Avenue.
Wright-Austin Co., 315 West Woodbridge.
Wright, Kay, & Co., 1500 Woodward Avenue.
Wulf, William, Co., 10042 West Chicago Boulevard.

Yankee Fibre File Manufacturing Co., 51 Selden.
Yawman & Erbe Manufacturing Co., 453 West Fort Street.
Young Bros. Co., 6500 Mack Avenue.

Zack, M. W., Metal Co., 2130 Howard.
Zenith Carburetor Co., foot of Hart.

One out of every \$7 spent in this industrialized area is derived from foreign trade.

Although Michigan derives the major portion of its wealth from its highly industrialized production, agriculture also is important in the State's total economy. Canned fruits and vegetables produced by Michigan farmers find important outlets abroad. The Michigan farmer has a stake in the international trade, not only to the extent that his own production moves directly into foreign trade, but also to the extent that the goods made for export by industry provide its workers with the purchasing power which is so essential to the farmers' market.

Michigan's agricultural industry is a large contributing factor in Michigan's total economy. Our agricultural production is greatly diversified, consisting chiefly of grain, livestock, fruits, dried beans, vegetables, and dairy products. To be sure, only the canned fruits and vegetables move into the export trade, but Detroit, a city which is so largely dependent upon exports, alone absorbs nearly half of the Michigan farmers' produce. In this connection, I should like to refer to several of the statements made by Mr. Gifford, who said to the committee:

As near as I can tell, I am the only person who has appeared before this committee as yet who has been actively on the firing line in the export business. In the last 30 years, since I started on my first trip abroad, I have spent 18 of those years living in foreign countries. I have covered all parts of the world many times except the Far East, and the war stopped that. There have been many questions and many statements made that I think could have been answered and answered quickly and easily by someone who is in the export business.

I have listened here for several days to the discussions, and frankly most of it seems to me to be entirely theoretical. It is being approached from an academic angle as to the theory of the export business. Actually, I think, if these same men, had to get out and try and sell merchandise in the foreign market they would take a different slant. I have heard the argument made yesterday, I think by an eminent writer, Mr. Peek, that there seemed to be any number of ways in which this could be handled. At one time apparently in his book he felt that it ought to be put in the hands of a committee of responsible citizens.

Mr. WOODRUFF. He still believes that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like to know what a group of responsible citizens would be, unless he picked them himself. If I pick them

I would believe that they would be responsible. At the present time he says that the present bunch are not responsible. Maybe they are not, but my experience with them has sold me and has sold a good many manufacturers on the fact that they are serious and conscientious in handling it.

I can think of no testimony which we heard which so adequately answers all the criticism of the opposition as does the statement by this witness. Mr. Gifford went on to give us page, sentence, paragraph, and verse of his experience and that of innumerable other manufacturers with the operation of this program not only as it applies to exports but also as it affects imports into the United States.

I am convinced that the trade-agreements program has been a great benefit to the automotive industry and, since the manufacture of automobiles affects the economy of every State, every county, every city, and every hamlet in our Nation, I am sure that the benefit which the trade-agreements program has brought to that great industry has spread its blessing throughout all phases of our economic life.

I am also equally convinced that the operations of this program have not injured any segment of our farm or industrial life. To be sure, the operation of this program may have resulted in occasional hardships or temporary dislocation for isolated groups here and there; but I feel certain that once the momentary difficulty of the adjustment necessitated by tariff change is passed that these people will reap and have had benefits far greater than that which they could have enjoyed had the status quo been maintained.

Let us examine for a moment the importance of the foreign market to the American auto industry. In normal times 10 percent to 15 percent of the automobiles produced in the United States are sold abroad. In proportion to the total production, foreign outlets are much more important to the manufacturers of trucks, who sell upward of 25 percent of their output outside the United States, as compared with the 10 percent to 15 percent sold by the makers of passenger vehicles.

In 1929, the peak year of automotive exports, \$539,300,000 of American automobiles were sold abroad. By 1933 this had dropped to the disastrously low figure of \$90,600,000. In the years in which we have seen the trade-agreements program in operation automobile exports have steadily climbed and in 1937 reached the high level of \$346,900,000. Although 1939 was not as good a year as 1937, it none the less accounted for exports valued at \$253,700,000.

I have already inserted in the committee hearings a list of the concessions which have been obtained for the automobile manufacturer and the exports under these concessions in 1937. I will not bore you with a repetition of this list, but I do want to point out to you that 19 of the 20 trade agreements now in effect cover automotive products and that in 1937 these concessions applied to some 90 percent of all of the exports in that year. The indirect effect of this upon our national economy can be best visualized if we examine the proportion of the national consumption of our leading raw materials which go into the making of automobiles.

The automotive industry in 1938 consumed the following proportion of total United States consumption:

Raw materials used in automobile industry in 1938
[Quantities in thousands]

Commodity	United States total consumption	Automotive consumption	Percent automotive
Steel (gross tons).....	18,693	3,156	16.9
Iron, malleable (tons).....	334	176	53.0
Rubber, crude (long tons).....	411	329	80.0
Plate glass (square feet).....	91,000	63,000	69.0
Leather, upholstery (square feet).....	32,670	21,156	65.0
Aluminum (tons).....	124	13	10.6
Copper (tons).....	605	73	12.1
Tin (long tons).....	65	6	9.2
Lead (tons).....	546	192	35.1
Zinc (tons).....	421	43	10.3
Nickel (pounds).....	43,547	12,600	29.0
Cotton (bales).....	5,903	619	10.5
Mohair (pounds).....	17,200	6,300	36.6
Lumber, hardwood (board-feet).....	3,005,000	100,000	3.2
Glycerine (pounds).....	134,614	17,500	13.0

Source: Automobile Manufacturers Association.

In addition, the automobile industry was the principal consumer of the following materials which, although not directly produced in the United States, nonetheless provide a substantial amount of industry and employment here:

	Percent
Rubber.....	80
Tin.....	9
Nickel.....	29

The relative importance of the automotive industry as a factor in our broad national economy can best be demonstrated by reference to the industry's employment and pay roll. In the year which most of us think of as the peak—1929—the automotive industry employed 448,000 workers and paid them \$14,682,000 per week. In the peak year of the industry—which was 1937, incidentally—employment averaged 517,000 workers, and their weekly pay roll was \$15,659,000. Figures for 1939 are not yet available, but the indications are that they will closely approach the 1937 level.

Again I repeat that I would not support the trade-agreements program if it had been a benefit only to the automotive industry, because I realize that, even though the automobile industry is important to this country, it is still but one part of the economy affecting the well-being of these United States. In this respect it is interesting to note the position taken by the Automobile Manufacturers' Association. In their statement before the committee they said:

We are not only concerned, however, with the effect of this act on our foreign business. Between 85 and 90 percent of the cars and trucks made in this country are sold here, and between 10 and 15 percent are exported.

We would not endorse trade agreements if it were thought they jeopardized or adversely affected the home market, where such a preponderance of our production is sold. During recent weeks fear has been expressed by some opposed to this act that increased imports will be harmful to the welfare of the American farmer. We do not share this belief. As a group, the farmers of this country are our best customers, and we are certainly mindful of those who buy such a large share of our products. To the contrary, we believe that the duty reductions that have been made have had no serious effect on the agricultural industry, while increased exports have widened the market for farm products.

Nothing has strengthened me in my support of this program so much as the failure of the opposition to demonstrate any adequate basis for their complaint. Let me touch briefly upon three subjects which have been the cause of much of the vocal criticism of the program and to point out a few of the most obvious weaknesses of these arguments. The subjects to which I refer are cattle, silver fox furs, and beans.

There has been much wailing and complaining about the injuries sustained by the cattle producers and to hear some of the testimony you would think the situation is hopeless. I am not an expert but I know an expert when I see and hear one. This House has among its Members several cattlemen, none more able or qualified to speak for these producers than our colleague from Oklahoma, PHIL FERGUSON. I am willing to rest my case on his testimony. Let us see what he has to say about the matter:

Any informed cattleman knows that the industry has not suffered due to the reciprocal-trade treaties. The figures reported by Mr. GEARHART are a sample of the misinformation that has gone out to the country; 57,000 cattle imported in 1934, and he compares that with some six or seven hundred thousand imported in 1939.

I can say to the committee that if the domestic price of cattle had been the same in 1939 that it was in 1934 there would have been no increase in imports. They simply could not have paid the existing tariff under the reciprocal-trade treaties and come into this country. We still have a very effective protective tariff on cattle.

I might add that the cattle industry has been so much harmed by the imports of cattle under trade agreements that it is the only item among our agriculture products which is now enjoying parity prices, while other segments of our farm production on which rates have not been reduced by trade agreements are only able to yield some 75 percent or less of their parity price.

Because it is a matter of primary importance to the farmers of my State and because Michigan is the largest producer in the country, I would like to devote a moment or two to the question of dried beans. Let me say first, that dried beans have not been included in any trade agreements but the

commodity was one of those listed for consideration in the proposal for a trade agreement with Chile.

Let me say first that from what I have seen of the operation of the trade-agreements procedure and from the information submitted by witnesses at our hearings, I am convinced that if there was any likelihood that a reduction in the rate of duty on dried beans would harm our farmers, that no such reduction would be made. I will nonetheless cite a few pertinent factors affecting any consideration bearing upon the commodity.

Production of beans in the United States has increased steadily in recent years. Production which ranged from nine to eleven million bags a year in the early twenties, increased to ten to twelve million bags per annum in the latter part of the decade, and since 1930 has ranged from eleven to fifteen and one-half million bags a year. Production which amounted to 11.4 million in 1936 jumped to 14.6 million in 1937 and was followed by the second largest crop on record in 1938, of 15.3 million bags. The estimated production for 1939 was 14,000,000 bags. Imports have ranged from less than 1 to 3 percent of domestic production. Although exports have usually been much less than 1 percent of domestic production, in 1938 exports actually exceeded imports. The present drag on the bean market is centered in the 3,500,000-bag surplus. The testimony relating to beans as advanced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] does not stand up, it is not worth the printing space in the RECORD. He was equally as forceful and trustworthy when he argued about imports of cabbage even after he added sauerkraut.

We have heard frequent references to the existence of a large surplus of beans, with an attempt to establish by implication that this results from excess importations. I need not discuss the fallacy of such statements. The figures themselves adequately demonstrate that if there is any surplus, it cannot be due to imports, but is directly the result of the increased production and successive bumper crops produced by our own farmers.

The present duty on beans is 3 cents per pound, or \$3 per bag. Insurance, commissions, and other expenses add about \$1 a bag to the cost of foreign beans landed in the United States. Thus, even if beans were obtained gratuitously abroad, the price in the United States would have to be more than \$4 per hundredweight before it would pay anyone to bring them into this country. In the brief against any reduction in the rate of duty on beans which was submitted by the Michigan Bean Growers and introduced into the RECORD by my colleague from Michigan, Mr. WOODRUFF, the farm prices shown have been \$4 and more in only two of the last 10 years. In 1937, 1938, and 1939, the prices have averaged \$2.50 per hundred and less. Even with the impetus given commodity prices by the outbreak of the present hostilities in Europe, the highest price for beans reached on September 15, 1939, was but \$3.50 per hundred.

I am wondering how at these prices beans, which must bear shipping and other handling expenses of \$1 per hundred plus a duty of \$3 per hundred, or even if the duty were reduced by the full 50 percent allowed by the law, \$1.50 per hundred, how anyone thinks that foreign beans could be brought into this country and sold at prices which would be competitive to our farmers.

The implication advanced by those who would abrogate trade agreements that bean prices were affected by the mere fact that they were listed for consideration with another nation or that the relatively unimportant concession made to Cuba on fresh lima beans and imported in December through May is entirely groundless. Anyone who can do a little simple arithmetic can see how absurd it would be to anticipate imports of dried beans unless the prices were so high in this market that they not only attracted imports, but also brought great satisfaction to the bean producers of the United States.

The overwhelming weight of the evidence offered before the committee is in favor of the continuance of the policy of trade agreements and the extension of the act. The opposition failed to make out a case, not because of the

lack of ability on the part of those who appeared, but because there was an insufficiency of substance to sustain their position. The sentiment of the people throughout the Nation, and they are well informed, make you no mistake about that, is in line with the preponderance of the evidence and for the extension of the act.

Some of the testimony in opposition was painfully strained, twisted, and stretched. In one instance as regards furs, in spite of the endorsement given by the accredited and well-informed spokesman for the fox and fur producers, adverse testimony predicated upon bias and misrepresentation was given the committee, which, when analyzed, proved to be stretched to the sixth dimension of baselessness.

Let me quote briefly from the statement of Maurice Fitzsimmons, the spokesman for 90 percent of the fur producers of America, let us see what he has to say about the trade-agreement policy:

We feel rather keenly in the fur industry about this reciprocal trade agreement program because the industry, starting with the outbreak of the European war, was threatened with a very serious crisis.

Our breeders were going to go broke if they continued producing silver fox and if all of the European pelts were dumped into this country.

A tariff would not help us one iota. * * * In a case like that silver-fox furs might be worth \$2 or \$3 in the European market * * * a 50-percent or 100-percent tariff would mean nothing on that when we have a cost of production in America, as I said before, of about \$26 to \$28 per pelt.

Finally, we turned to the reciprocal-trade agreements, and there we found a cooperative group of men * * * we sat around the table and discussed with them as to what would be the logical way out; and that through the power of the elasticity of the trade agreements were able to enact a quota.

Now to me that is important and it seems to me imperative that you continue on the statute books of these United States an elastic trade law that can meet emergencies. * * *

I hope that you are going to continue to have that type of law on the statute books of these United States so that we can continue to go ahead with confidence.

We had another sale in January, at which time the price was up 43 percent over December levels, and we had a 95-percent sale. I think that in itself shows what happened to the fur trade, to the fur buyers, and to the producers, as a result of this quota that was set up through the reciprocal trade agreement program.

When the country was for the greater part agricultural, to that extent we were dependent upon the farmer for prosperity. Now that the United States is three-fourths or more industrial, the reverse is true. The farm producer at no time in recent years lost the major part of his export market and always retained unimpaired the home market with perhaps a slight fluctuation. Certainly that is true as it applies to the major commodities, such as cattle, hogs, sheep, corn, wheat, rye, and other grains, as well as fruits, vegetables, and dairy products. In these and many other instances, the American market has been invulnerable to foreign penetration and has been held to our farmers to the extent of 95 to 99½ percent.

Manufacturing industries fared perhaps as well in the home market, but the export markets have in many instances fallen off as high as 90 percent of previous exports. That is what hurt the American farmer and his business. When you cripple industry with its vast buying power, the suffering affects not alone the industries, but also the farmer and the whole Nation.

Remember, always, America today is three-fourths or more industrial, urban, and one-fourth or less rural and agricultural. If the farm producer retains 90 percent or more of his valuable home market and industry loses a great percentage of its foreign market, is it not reasonable to assume that a prop for industry will be a prop for the farmer? I sincerely believe that is the case.

What I tried to show here, Mr. Chairman, is that the trade agreements are of much benefit to all the people and to all lines of business in every State in the Union, including the manufacturer, the farmer, the merchant, the banker, and the rail- and steamship-transportation operators; and that not only were the industries and farm producers for whom concessions were obtained under the act directly benefited but through them, as for example through the auto industry,

many other producers in the city and the farm reaped indirect benefits.

The evidence proves conclusively that prosperity in the auto industry resulting from trade agreements contributes to the prosperity of the farmer whether he produces hogs, cattle, grain, or even silver-fox furs. Our auto workers when employed eat well, dress well, and even buy silver-fox furs for their wives and daughters.

I believe I made it clear, too, that the stimulating effect of the concessions obtained for farmers and fruit growers has been felt by the manufacturers and particularly the automobile manufacturers.

I hope I may have contributed in a small measure something of value toward convincing some of the Members regarding the soundness of the trade agreements as an economical instrumentality which is really workable and ought to be continued. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Houston].

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, the noted economist Mr. Roger W. Babson recently declared:

The reciprocal-trade program has been a truly bright spot of the New Deal. In his quiet but firm way Secretary Hull has fought harder for peace in this decade than any other man alive. He is a tower of strength, vision, and unselfishness. His program has increased our exports to countries with whom we have completed agreements by 60 percent, while our exports to those countries with which we have not bargained have expanded less than 40 percent. Moreover, our imports from treaty nations have not increased any faster than with nontreaty nations. This, in a nutshell, tells the effectiveness of the program, its aid to jobs and industry.

Mr. Babson wrote other words of wisdom, as follows:

The G. O. P. needs campaign ammunition and they will make the most of decrying these trade pacts. They claim, for instance, that the program permits an excessive influx of farm products—\$800,000,000 worth in 1939. But Secretary Hull points out that \$530,000,000 of this was coffee, rubber, silk, cocoa, bananas, which have always been admitted duty-free.

And again in the statement:

The importance of world trade has never been fully realized by most people. Foreign commerce is the keystone of world prosperity and peace. Our overseas markets in good times absorbed only 10 percent of our total output, but that 10 percent was a vital 10 percent. Half of our cotton crop, for instance, was sold abroad. Think of the importance of cotton to United States prosperity.

And in defense of Secretary Hull, he wrote:

Secretary Hull (a former Senator) knew that the only way to lower tariffs and increase employment as a whole would be a reduction program which excused constituent-conscious Congressmen from voting to ratify it. Hence, the State Department's trade program came into being.

To separate foreign trade from politics—

Ran an editorial in the Star Free Press (independent), Ventura, Calif.—

Shades of Willis Hawley and Reed Smoot. If ever politics sired a vampire to suck the lifeblood out of our foreign trade, the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930 was it. The Hull program, far from being bound up in politics, was designed to rid our foreign trade of the curse of politically logrolled tariff barriers behind which our commerce had languished. Many of the roots of the present war are traceable to the tariff walls which crisscrossed post-Versailles Europe. If we retreat to Hawley-Smootism, as Senators McNARY, CAPPER, and others seem to desire, we may very well be putting down the roots of our participation in this or another war. It would mean crawling into the shell of economic nationalism, with everything that phrase implies in lowered living standards, regimentation of agriculture and industry, and international animosity. * * * Conceivably there have been inequities involving particular farm products, and if so the farmer is justified in seeking redress. But if he has a vivid recollection of the early 1930's—as what farmer has not—surely he will hesitate before being sold that bill of shoddy goods again.

Senator CAPPER is reported to have once said in the Senate:

Our experience in writing tariff legislation has been discouraging. Trading between groups and sections is inevitable. Logrolling is inevitable, and in most pernicious form. We do not write a national tariff law. We join together through various unholy alliances and combinations a potpourri of hodgepodge, sectional and local tariff rates which often add to our troubles and increase world misery.

Now he wants to go back to it.

But reciprocal-trade agreements negotiated under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 have, beyond doubt, been of advantage to the State of Kansas and to agriculture, the prin-

cipal industry of the State. Renewal of the authority of the President to negotiate these agreements offers further valuable benefits. Failure to renew this authorization, on the other hand, means definite and serious loss and danger to the interests of Kansas, both farmers and others.

While important reductions in foreign barriers against exports of commodities grown on Kansas farms have been obtained through the agreements, these reductions are not the only, or perhaps even the most important, advantages of the program to Kansas. Nevertheless it is a fact that through trade agreements, 11 countries have reduced their barriers against American wheat and wheat flour. Great Britain removed, entirely, her preferential tariff of 6 cents a bushel on American wheat, and Canada reduced her duty. Nine other countries made concessions of various sorts on these products.

Kansas corn-hog farmers have had their export markets for pork products and lard improved by agreements with 17 countries, including our most important foreign customers for these products. These concessions cover all forms of hog products—lard, hams, bacon, and fresh and frozen pork—and beef and veal. They have helped to sustain and enlarge foreign markets for American meat products and have provided jobs for men in Kansas packing plants and on Kansas railroads.

Many factors other than trade agreements have influenced our international trade since the Trade Agreements Act was passed, and no statistical analysis can show exactly and conclusively, commodity by commodity and agreement by agreement, just what part each trade agreement has played. There have been wars and preparations for war, droughts and bumper crops, fluctuations in industrial and business activity, both in this country and abroad. They have all had their effects. But plain common sense shows that when foreign restrictions on exports of American products are reduced or removed, the foreign market for these products is better than it would have been if the trade-agreements program had not removed the obstacles.

Notwithstanding the powerful adverse factors that have been operating, and the difficulty of determining exactly the direct effect of trade agreements, there is plenty of statistical evidence to show that the agreements have been enlarging and supporting United States foreign trade. Between the fiscal year ended June 30, 1936, and that ended June 30, 1939, United States exports of all commodities to trade-agreement countries increased more than two and one-half times as much as did exports to nonagreement countries.

In that period, United States exports of farm products to trade-agreement countries increased 15 percent, while exports of farm products to nonagreement countries declined 19 percent. United States imports of all commodities from trade-agreement countries declined, in the years under comparison, by 2 percent; imports from nonagreement countries declined four times as much.

Nor have the advantages of foreign concessions on American exports been limited, as far as Kansas is concerned, to those on exports of farm products. Kansas grows crops and produces livestock to feed Americans as well as to feed foreigners. Increased exports of American industrial goods—automobiles, machinery, iron and steel products, typewriters, and dozens of other nonagricultural products on which concessions have been obtained through the trade agreements—mean more American industrial workers with money to buy beef, pork, dairy products, and many other things which come from the soil of Kansas. Not the least important customers of the Kansas farmer are railroad workers, of whom there are thousands in Kansas. It is sufficiently obvious that goods moving in either interstate or international trade mean more freight traffic and more men on railroad pay rolls able to buy the products of Kansas farms.

In return for the concessions that have been obtained for American exports, including those produced in Kansas, the United States has made adjustments in its own tariffs on certain products imported from other countries. It is an all-too-prevalent delusion that every such an adjustment is harmful to Americans and deprives American producers of

some share of their domestic market. Tariff reductions under the trade-agreements program are made only after the most careful study by men from the Tariff Commission and from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and State to determine that they will not be harmful to American producers. When necessary these reductions are hedged about with safeguards and restrictions to prevent their resulting in depressed prices to American producers.

The trade-agreements program has not deprived the American farmer of any of his share of the domestic market for farm goods which he can produce, nor has it lowered his prices and income from products on which tariffs have been reduced. In 1929, when farm cash income in the United States was up to eleven and one-fourth billion dollars, the American farmer supplied 90 percent of the domestic market for farm products. In 1933, the last full year before the inauguration of the trade-agreements program, he supplied 93 percent of that market, but received a cash income of only five and one-fourth billion dollars. In 1938 he still supplied 93 percent of the domestic market and received a cash income of nearly seven and three-fourths billion dollars.

His share of the domestic market is not so important to the American farmer as how big and how profitable to him that market is, and how much income he gets from supplying it. Because the trade-agreements program stimulates industrial, transportation, and business activity in the United States, it helps to make the American home market bigger and better for the American farmer.

Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace stated to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on January 12:

I do not know of a single case in which such duty reductions have seriously inconvenienced any American agricultural industry. As a matter of fact, in cases where a damaging influx of agricultural products might take place as a result of duty reductions, meticulous care has been taken to see that safeguards were introduced to prevent such an influx.

The Secretary of Agriculture cited as an example the imports of beef cattle under concessions granted by the United States in the trade agreement with Canada. This concession has been frequently and untruthfully described as a threat to the American cattle industry.

The facts are that the concession applies to only two classes of beef cattle, those weighing 700 pounds or more each, and those weighing 200 pounds or less each. Furthermore, the tariff reduction under the agreement is limited by quotas. Not more than 225,000 head of beef cattle weighing over 700 pounds each—slightly over 1 percent of the average annual slaughter of cattle and calves in the United States—can be admitted to this country under reduced duty in any one calendar year, and not more than 60,000 in any one 3-month period. The reduced duty on calves applies to not more than 100,000 head per year. On beef cattle weighing more than 200 but less than 700 pounds each there has been no reduction of the 1930 tariff rate of 3 cents a pound. And this class of cattle made up 54 percent of all the beef cattle imported into the United States in 1939.

Imports of beef cattle into the United States in 1939 were 328,388 head greater than imports in 1938, but nearly half of the total increase was in cattle of a class on which the duty had not been reduced; and, in addition, 22,674 head of cattle falling in the classes on which duties have been reduced, paid the full 1930 tariff because of the tariff-quota restrictions in the Canadian agreement.

Kansas cattlemen, and producers of other things as well, who have been told that their industries would be threatened by huge influxes of imported meat products as a result of tariff reductions through trade agreements, should recall that very recently negotiations for agreements with Argentina and with Uruguay were terminated because the negotiators for this country were unwilling to grant the provisions which might have made possible such an influx. They insisted upon qualifications, quotas, and restrictions for the protection of American meat producers. Both those proposed agreements were of extreme importance from the viewpoint of international politics in the present crisis. But the United

States Government refused to "sell American cattlemen and farmers down the river" in order to put them into effect.

The real clinching evidence on whether the concessions on cattle in the Canadian trade agreement have damaged the interests of American cattle producers is the fact that the average farm price received by American farmers for beef cattle in 1939 averaged \$6.87 a hundred pounds against \$6.28 in 1938. The farm price of beef cattle in the United States has been above parity every month in 1939, and in part because the trade-agreements program has stimulated industrial activity in the United States and enabled American workmen to buy more beef.

There have been equally misleading statements about increased imports of wheat into the United States in 1939 as compared with 1938. The fact is that no United States tariff on wheat fit for human consumption has been lowered under any trade agreement. The only wheat tariff that has been lowered is that on wheat unfit for human consumption, wheat that American farmers import to feed to their livestock. Imports of wheat into the United States for milling in bond and reexport—making jobs for Americans in mills and on railroads—increased in 1939 over 1938 by some 6,000,000 bushels, and made up almost the entire importation in both 1938 and 1939. No flour from that wheat entered the United States market.

Wheat imported into the United States for human consumption here—about 215,000 bushels in 1939—all pays the full 1930 tariff rate of 42 cents a bushel. These imports in 1939 amounted to about three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the United States wheat production and about three-tenths of 1 percent of United States wheat exports in the same year. Efforts to make these figures show a flood of competitive imported wheat would be ridiculous even if the imports had received any duty reduction, which they have not.

Kansas farmers, like those of other States, are keenly aware of the disparity between the prices they receive for the things they sell, and the prices they must pay for the things they buy on a tariff-protected market. The trade-agreements program is one of the most effective of the measures which this Government is taking to correct that disparity. Through the trade agreements, this country has reduced its tariffs on scores of articles that farmers buy, offsetting at least in part the monopolistic advantage which the tariff has long given to industry in the United States.

According to a recent estimate by the Department of Agriculture, based upon 1935 statistics, tariff duties on products the farmer consumes, if fully effective in raising prices on those articles, would have cost American farmers in that year \$681,000,000, or \$108 for each farm family.

In 1933 the ratio of prices received by farmers in the United States to the prices they paid, was 64 to 100 against the farmer. In 1939 this ratio was only 77 to 100. In 1933 farm cash income in Kansas was \$152,000,000 and in 1939 it was \$241,000,000, a gain of 58 percent. Kansas farmers contrast these trends upward in income and prices with the steep downward trends in the 4 years 1930-33 under the Hawley-Smoot tariff policy.

Under the trade-agreements program, the United States has reduced tariffs on more industrial imports than agricultural imports, contrary to a frequent misstatement. On the other hand, the trade agreements have yielded to the United States concessions on a greater proportion of our agricultural than of our industrial exports. The statistics stand for themselves as an answer to the charge that under this program the American farmer has been "sold down the river for the benefit of the manufacturer."

It is true that world economic conditions have changed—and for the worse—since the adoption of the trade-agreements program in 1934, a program in which 21 of the principal trading nations of the world have joined with the United States. There is war in Europe and war in the Orient. Nations, for their own defense, are adopting rigorous controls over their internal economies and their foreign commerce—measures widely at variance with the principles of the trade-agreements program. But these facts offer no reason for

abandoning now the program which is, in fact, the only available mechanism for meeting realistically the wartime conditions of international trade.

The policy and the framework of procedure laid down by Congress in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 are broad enough to enable the President and his advisers from the Tariff Commission and the other Government departments to make the necessary technical changes and adjustments in our commercial relations with foreign countries, and to make them speedily, scientifically, and efficiently. If wartime trade must be carried on under restrictions and difficulties, the Trade Agreements Act and the trade-agreements organization are equal to the job. To abandon them now would leave the United States with no flexible and effective mechanism for protecting the interests of American agriculture and American industry either during the perilous time of war or in the post-war period of reconstruction.

In all ways, the Trade Agreements Act and the trade-agreements program conform to the requirements of a resolution adopted by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture at its sixty-ninth annual meeting, January 10-12, 1940. That resolution reads:

TARIFFS AND TREATIES

Reciprocal-trade treaties, when negotiated, should have the unanimous support and approval of the Secretary of State, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce. They should be primarily for the purpose of restoring the export outlets for surplus commodities. We insist that this principle be adhered to in framing future trade treaties and that there be no reduction, either by legislative enactment or through treaties, in present agricultural tariffs on any farm product that would have the effect of holding or reducing domestic price levels below a proper balance with industrial prices.

The Trade Agreement Act, by its own terms, requires the approval of the Secretaries of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, for every agreement before the agreement is concluded. Congress, in passing the act, wrote into it as its purpose the enlargement of foreign markets for American products. The figures I have already given provide statistical proof that under this program the domestic price levels of farm goods have been helped to rise toward the proper balance with industrial prices, and have not been held down or reduced.

In the past 5 years the reciprocal trade-agreements program has proved its benefits in peacetime to industry and agriculture in Kansas and in the United States as a whole. Now, with wars raging in foreign countries, it is needed more urgently than ever to protect our interests and maintain our living standards. When the wars shall have ended, regardless of who are the victors or what alignments of nations shall emerge, the principles of the trade-agreements program offer a sound and tested foundation upon which the United States can take the leadership in setting up a new and better world economy. [Applause.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans listened to the speech made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], who spoke very feelingly of the industrialists who are manufacturing motor vehicles in Michigan. He also called attention to the men and women who are working in the factories producing motor vehicles.

He forgot to tell you that the average wage for those working in the motor industry, including those who are sweeping floors and doing like tasks, is 90 cents per hour and that the average daily wage in the Ford factory for 8 hours' work is \$7.25; that, in contrast with that, the wages of the farmers, those who grow the food that keeps the factory worker alive, are less than \$1 per day for from an 8- to a 10-hour day.

Some day, and I hope it will be soon, the farmer is going to demand, and insist upon receiving, a fair return for his labor. No one begrudges the city worker a living wage. On the other hand those who live in the cities and who enjoy many advantages, which it is physically impossible for the farmer and his family to have, should show a little sympathy, a little willingness—while they are upholding unions which want an ever-increasing wage and an ever-lessening hour—to aid the farmer in securing parity payments for the things he grows and sells.

LXXXVI—106

EVENTUALLY, WHY NOT NOW?

The House might well adopt that well-known slogan. Eventually, if the A. F. of L. is not to be swallowed alive, independent unions and the freedom of the independent worker destroyed, and American labor turned over to the mercies of the C. I. O. revenue collectors, the National Labor Relations Act must be amended.

For 2 years or more the demand for the drastic amendment of this act has been steadily growing until today there is no longer any doubt but that the American people are insisting upon a change.

The House Labor Committee for more than a year successfully prevented any amendments coming to the floor of the House. The House, in unprecedented action, appointed a special committee to, among other things, determine whether the National Labor Relations Board had been fair and impartial in its interpretation and administration of the law; whether the act needed amendment, and, if it did, what amendments were deemed advisable. That action on the part of the House was taken—and this proposition admits of no successful contradiction—because the House deemed its regular labor committee either incompetent or indolent.

The House Labor Committee took this rebuke sitting, if not lying, down. It has been going through the motions now and then of hearing witnesses. But it seems, from surface indications, no nearer to reporting out a bill than it was 2 years ago.

In the meantime, the House special committee, doing an excellent job, has demonstrated from the files of the Board itself that it has, in part at least, the answers to questions 1, 3, and 4 contained in the resolution creating it.

Its hearings have shown, in answer to question 1, that the Board has not been fair and impartial.

Whatever may be said of the intelligence and the abstract legal learning of the reviewing attorneys appointed by the Board, it must be conceded that not a few have no judicial or industrial experience which would qualify them to pass upon the questions which are submitted.

As an illustration, permit me to cite the appointment, as a reviewing attorney at a salary of \$2,700 a year, of Ann Landy Wolf, a Hungarian woman, 27 years of age, who came to the United States in 1929, was naturalized in 1935; who has a husband drawing a salary of \$4,600 a year in another Government department; who was appointed by the Board to review thousands of pages of testimony and then to state orally to the Board her conclusions, based upon her examination of that testimony. She is but one of several of like type.

Young men, possessing no greater qualifications than did she and in some instances perhaps not as great ability as she, have performed like functions.

The Board has employed trial examiners, one of whom, Pratt, made the statement to the effect that, when a hearing began, the employer "had two strikes on him." Another examiner, Seagle, called the statement of an attorney presenting a client's issue, a "lie" and referred to his argument as "idiotic discussions."

Another attorney, Solomon G. Lippman, 27 years of age, found to be incompetent for the work assigned to him, was transferred to another position with the Board and had his salary increased.

The hearings before the Smith committee have shown that the trial examiners and reviewing attorneys traveled outside the record, obtained and considered evidence which the party charged with an unfair labor practice had no opportunity to meet.

The Board, notwithstanding the fact that the N. L. R. A. itself provides that—section 4, subdivision (a)—

Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Board to appoint individuals for the purpose of conciliation or mediation (or for statistical work), where such service may be obtained from the Department of Labor—

Employed David G. Saposs, a Russian, whose writings clearly show that he is saturated with communistic doctrines, to make independent investigations and to report to investigators, trial and reviewing attorneys, and to the Board his,

Saposs', interpretation of testimony about to be given or testimony introduced in the hearings.

Now, get that proposition. Think of the viciousness, the downright wickedness, of the practice here in America of employing the methods of the Russia from which Saposs came. Can you conceive of anything more unfair, more destructive of confidence in administrative or judicial procedure, than the employing of an agent to go out and make an ex parte investigation and then report to an administrative officer or board his conclusions as to what certain testimony meant?

Such a procedure deprives the man accused of an unfair labor practice of his day in court. It deprives him of his right to be confronted with the witnesses against him. It deprives him of the right of cross-examination. It deprives him of an opportunity to meet and refute the charge which has been made against him. It deprives him of a fair, open trial.

Our Supreme Court on two occasions—in the Scottsboro case and in the case decided within the past week—has set aside the conviction of a number of Negroes on the sole ground that they did not have a fair and an impartial trial, this although there was much evidence to show that these men were guilty of a most revolting criminal offense.

Is the American employer to be denied a lesser opportunity—in fact, all opportunity—to meet his accusers face to face?

The hearings before the Smith committee have disclosed from the files of the Board itself that Lee Pressman, general counsel of the C. I. O., on the 2d day of June 1937 went to Pittsburgh, after consultation with the secretary of the Board, and instigated a strike; and that the Board thereafter aided in prolonging the strike by instituting charges against the Inland Steel Co. because it refused to perform an act not required by the National Labor Relations Act; an act which the Supreme Court had said it need not perform; an act which the purported author of the act had declared it could not be required to do.

The investigations show that the Board has, by its conduct, aided in the organizing campaigns of one labor organization.

The hearings before the Smith committee disclose that Chairman Madden has employed the methods of the blackmailer, of the extortionist, in his effort to coerce companies into the making of collective-bargaining contracts. This has been demonstrated by his own letters, which show that he asked another agency of the Government, the R. F. C., to withhold loans, not only from those who had been found guilty of unfair labor practices but from those who were about to be charged or were charged with the violation of the National Labor Relations Act. Such conduct is indefensible and no one who was not utterly obsessed with the idea that he was above the law would undertake such a course.

Enough has been said to show the utter unfairness of the present Board to fairly perform its duties. In passing, it might be added that the Chairman of the Board has, on more than one occasion, seen fit to use his official position and Federal funds appropriated for the administration of the act in an effort to create discord between members of the A. F. of L. and officials of that organization, with reference to the amendment of the act—this in violation of a Federal statute.

It is one thing for members of a Government department to appear before committees of Congress, having charge of legislation affecting their department, and express their views fairly and accurately. It is an entirely different thing for members of a Federal department to, unsolicited, use public funds in an effort to secretly induce third persons to lobby for measures the passage of which, directly or indirectly, inure to the benefit of that particular department. The function of department officials is to administer the laws enacted by Congress and give Congress the benefit of their experience.

There is no longer, on the record made by the Smith committee, on the record made in the public press, any doubt but that the Board is biased, partisan, and wholly unfitted for the interpretation and administration of the act.

The Evening Star of last Saturday carried what purported to be a statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr.

SMITH], chairman of the House investigating committee, that he hoped whatever amendments the committee might endorse would be reported to the House Labor Committee within 2 weeks, and that he stressed the need for quick action if any change is to be made in the National Labor Relations Act at the present session.

It is encouraging to know that the chairman of the special committee has reached that conclusion. For more than a year I have been suggesting to the House that, if it really wanted the N. L. R. A. amended, there was no reason why it should not do so.

About a year ago I suggested to the House that, so far as legislation was concerned, the House Labor Committee appeared to be trying to incubate a setting of china eggs or doorknobs. The same procedure apparently continues.

A further comment in the newspaper article referred to was to the effect that outstanding amendments now being considered by the special committee included: First, abolition of the present three-man Labor Board and its replacement by a new five-man Board. That provision can be incorporated in H. R. 4990, introduced by me in March of 1939.

Another provision being considered by the Smith committee is: Second, complete separation of the prosecuting and judicial functions of the Board. If you have the time and the patience to read it, you will find that H. R. 4990 contains a provision accomplishing that very thing.

Provision 3, now being considered by the committee, is as follows:

(3) Removal of the Board's authority to settle disputes among rival unions, such as the feuds between the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which have caused so much bitterness in the last few years.

H. R. 4990 does not contain that provision, but I have an amendment to that effect drafted, and as soon as Lee Pressman, general counsel for the C. I. O., commits himself, if he can be induced to commit himself either for or against such a provision when he testifies this week before the House Labor Committee, I will offer a bill containing that amendment.

H. R. 4990 contains many other amendments which, if we ever get a fair and just labor law, will be included in such an act.

It is a strange spectacle to see a House of Representatives, with a membership of over 400, acknowledge, as it does acknowledge, that the National Labor Relations Act should be amended and to watch that House, so paralyzed by what?—you answer—that it either cannot or will not bring out on the floor of the House a bill introduced to amend an act which we know should be amended, and there in open debate show its competency to perform the task entrusted to it by the people by writing a just and equitable labor law.

If you want action, walk up to the Clerk's desk and sign petition No. 23. Bring out the bill I introduced; then throw it in the wastebasket, if you wish, but write something in answer to the demand which our constituents have been making upon us. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 407, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include some tables therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including a speech made by Col. Robert R. McCormack at the Lincoln Club banquet, Jackson, Mich., on the 15th of this month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an address delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture before the Agriculture Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the afternoon a member of the minority requested the majority to place in the RECORD the names of a thousand or so economists who protested the enactment of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 5, 1930, which supplies this information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TARIFF PROTEST BY ECONOMISTS AND TEACHERS OF ECONOMICS

The undersigned American economists and teachers of economics strongly urge that any measure which provides for a general upward revision of tariff rates be denied passage by Congress, or if passed be vetoed by the President.

We are convinced that increased protective duties would be a mistake. They would operate, in general, to increase the prices which domestic consumers would have to pay. By raising prices they would encourage concerns with higher costs to undertake production, thus compelling the consumer to subsidize waste and inefficiency in industry. At the same time they would force him to pay higher rates of profit to established firms which enjoyed lower production costs. A higher level of protection, such as is contemplated by both the House and Senate bills, would therefore raise the cost of living and injure the great majority of our citizens.

Few people could hope to gain from such a change. Miners, construction, transportation and public-utility workers, professional people, and those employed in banks, hotels, newspaper offices, in the wholesale and retail trades, and scores of other occupations would clearly lose, since they produce no products which could be protected by tariff barriers.

The vast majority of farmers, also, would lose. Their cotton, corn, lard, and wheat are export crops and are sold in the world market. They have no important competition in the home market. They cannot benefit, therefore, from any tariff which is imposed upon the basic commodities which they produce. They would lose through the increased duties on manufactured goods, however, and in a double fashion. First, as consumers they would have to pay still higher prices for the products, made of textiles, chemicals, iron, and steel, which they buy. Second, as producers, their ability to sell their products would be further restricted by the barriers placed in the way of foreigners who wished to sell manufactured goods to us.

Our export trade, in general, would suffer. Countries cannot permanently buy from us unless they are permitted to sell to us, and the more we restrict the importation of goods from them by means of ever higher tariffs the more we reduce the possibility of our exporting to them. This applies to such exporting industries as copper, automobiles, agricultural machinery, typewriters, and the like as fully as much as it does to farming. The difficulties of these industries are likely to be increased still further if we pass a higher tariff. There are already many evidences that such action would inevitably provoke other countries to pay us back in kind by levying retaliatory duties against our goods. There are few more ironical spectacles than that of the American Government, as it seeks, on the one hand, to promote exports through the activity of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, while, on the other hand, by increasing tariffs it makes exportation ever more difficult. President Hoover has well said, in his message to Congress on April 16, 1929, "It is obviously unwise protection which sacrifices a greater amount of employment in exports to gain a less amount of employment from imports."

We do not believe that American manufacturers, in general, need higher tariffs. The report of the President's committee on recent economic changes has shown that industrial efficiency has increased, that costs have fallen, that profits have grown with amazing rapidity since the end of the war. Already our factories supply our people with over 96 percent of the manufactured goods which they consume, and our producers look to foreign markets to absorb the increasing output of their machines. Further barriers to trade will serve them not well, but ill.

Many of our citizens have invested their money in foreign enterprises. The Department of Commerce has estimated that such investments, entirely aside from the war debts, amounted to between \$12,555,000,000 and \$14,555,000,000 on January 1, 1929. These

investors, too, would suffer if protective duties were to be increased, since such action would make it still more difficult for their foreign creditors to pay them the interest due them.

America is now facing the problem of unemployment. Her labor can find work only if her factories can sell their products. Higher tariffs would not promote such sales. We cannot increase employment by restricting trade. American industry, in the present crisis, might well be spared the burden of adjusting itself to new schedules of protective duties.

Finally we would urge our Government to consider the bitterness which a policy of higher tariffs would inevitably inject into our international relations. The United States was ably represented at the World Economic Conference which was held under the auspices of the League of Nations in 1927. This conference adopted a resolution announcing that "the time has come to put an end to the increase in tariffs and to move in the opposite direction." The higher duties proposed in our pending legislation violate the spirit of this agreement and plainly invite other nations to compete with us in raising further barriers to trade. A tariff war does not furnish good soil for the growth of world peace.

ORIGINATORS AND FIRST SIGNERS

Paul H. Douglas, professor of economics, University of Chicago.
Irving Fisher, professor of economics, Yale University.
Frank D. Graham, professor of economics, Princeton University.
Ernest M. Patterson, professor of economics, University of Pennsylvania.
Henry R. Seager, professor of economics, Columbia University.
Frank W. Taussig, professor of economics, Harvard University.
Clair Wilcox, associate professor of economics, Swarthmore College.

ADDITIONAL SIGNATURES

Alabama

University of Alabama: James Halladay.

Arizona

University of Arizona: Robert B. Pettingill.

Arkansas

University of Arkansas: Truman C. Bingham, Walter B. Cole, Kenneth Sharkey, C. C. Fichtner, A. W. Jamison, C. O. Branner, B. M. Gl'e.

Hendrix Henderson College: Ivan H. Grove, O. T. Gooden.

California

University of California: Ira B. Cross, Gordon S. Watkins, Stuart Daggett, M. M. Knight, Robert A. Brody, E. T. Grether, E. J. Brown, Lonn T. Morgan, Henry F. Grady, E. W. Braum, N. L. Silverstein.

Claremont College: Horace Secrist.

University of Southern California: Reid L. McClung.

University of Redlands: H. C. Tilton, Arthur D. Jacobson.

California Institute of Technology: Horace N. Gilbert.

Mills College: Glenn E. Hoover.

Stanford University: Dean W. E. Hotchkiss, Eliot Jones, Holbrook Working, Helen Cherington Farnsworth, Ada Fay Wyman, L. Elden Smith, Murray S. Wildman.

Pomona College: Kenneth Duncan, George I. Burgess, Norman Ness.

Armstrong College of Business Administration: Frank A. Haring, W. W. Diehl, J. Evan Armstrong, John H. Goff, George A. Letherman, J. Frank Day.

College of the Pacific: Robert C. Root, Luther Sharp, Laura M. Kingsbury.

Pasadena Junior College: Roscoe Lewis Ashley, Earl D. Davis, Leland M. Pryor, Fred G. Young, Louise H. Murdock, Henry P. Melnikow, Louis J. Hopkins, K. F. Berkeley, Walter W. Cooper, Howard S. Noble, L. S. Samra, Philip J. Webster, Claire Soderblom.

Colorado

University of Colorado: Dean Elmore Peterson, Frederick J. Bushee.

Colorado College: A. P. R. Drucker, J. G. Johnson, Edna Rose Groth.

University of Denver: H. W. Hudson.

State Agricultural College: D. N. Donaldson.

Colorado Wesleyan University: Clyde Olin Fisher, K. M. Williamson, Norman J. Ware.

Connecticut

Yale University: Ray B. Wosterfield, Fred R. Fairchild, Withrop M. Daniels, Jerome Davis, C. H. Whelden, Jr., Hudson B. Hastings, Ralph A. Jones, A. Barr, Jr., William W. Wertz, Triston R. Barnes, H. Berolzheimer, Geoffrey Crowther, Francis W. Hopkins.

Connecticut Agricultural College: Albert E. Waugh, Edward H. Gumbart, Cecil G. Tilton.

Trinity College: G. A. Kleene, George A. Suter, Henry W. Farnam, Curtis M. Geer, Charles A. Tuttle.

Delaware

University of Delaware: Claude L. Bonner, Harry S. Gabriel, J. Sidney Gould.

District of Columbia

Horace B. Drury, Frank J. Warne, Herbert O. Rogers, Arthur Sturgis, Boris Stern, Lester D. Johnson, Edith S. Gray, Arthur S. Field, W. H. Rowe, Glen L. Swiggett, John H. Gray, Jesse E. Pope, Harold Van V. Fay, Kurt Schneider, Charles E. Purans, Agnes L. Peterson, C. E. Clement, George B. L. Arner, William G. Elliot 3d, George B. Galloway, R. M. Boeckel.

Brookings Institution: C. C. Hardy, Leverett S. Lyon, Philip G. Wright, Lynn R. Edminister, W. M. Blaisdell, Gustavus A. Weber, Frank Tannenbaum, Freda Baird.

George Washington University: Harold G. Sutton, Richard N. Owens, Belva M. Owens.

American University: Charles F. Marsh, D. A. Kinsman.

Catholic University: The Reverend John A. Ryan.

Florida

Francis M. Williams, H. Clay Armstrong, Isaac W. Bernheim.

Rollins College: Glen E. Carlson, Leland H. Jenks.

University of Florida: Harwood B. Dolbeare, Howard M. Dykman, Rollin S. Atwood, W. T. Hicks, J. G. Eldridge, J. P. Wilson, P. C. Scaglione, Huber C. Hurst.

Georgia

University of Georgia: Dean R. P. Brooks, Glenn W. Sutton, James B. Summers, Malcolm H. Bryan, John W. Jenkins.

Agnes Scott College: James M. Wright.

Emory University: Edgar H. Johnson, Clark Warburton, Mercer G. Evans.

Idaho

University of Idaho: Irwin Crane.

College of Idaho: Robert Rockwood McCormick.

Illinois

University of Illinois: Merlin H. Hunter, D. H. Hoover, M. A. Weston, D. Phillip Locklin, Simon Litman, George U. Sanford, Paul E. Aiyer, Paul M. Vanarsdell, Edward Berman, Donald R. Taft, Horace M. Gray, Daniel Barth, Jr., D. M. Dalley, R. F. Smith.

Northwestern University: Earl Dean Howard, Spencer W. Myers, Arthur J. Todd, Charles A. R. Wardwell, A. D. Theobald, Harold A. Frey, Coleman Woodbury, Robert J. Ray, E. W. Morehouse, Helen C. Manchau.

James Milliken University: Jay L. O'Hara.

Monmouth College: J. S. Cleland.

University of Chicago: H. A. Millis, J. Laurence Laughlin, Henry Schultz, Garfield V. Cox, Chester W. Wright, Stuart P. Meech, H. G. Shields, Hazel Kyrk, James L. Palmer, Paul W. Stone, Martin Taitel, Helen R. Jeter, S. H. Nerlove, F. W. Clower, John U. Nef, Howard A. Baker, Charles J. Coe, Sara Landau, Arthur M. Welmer, Hilding B. Jack, Mary V. Covey, Leo McCarthy, May I. Morgan, R. W. Baldwin, Esther Essenshade.

Knox College: R. S. Steiner.

Lewis Institute: Judson F. Lee, P. S. Mata, E. J. Fowler, Carl Vrooman, A. D. Arado, Eugene W. Burgess, Ruth M. Kellogg, S. Leon Levy, Dorothy W. Douglas, Edward Manley, Willard S. Hall, O. David Zimring, E. W. Marcellus, I. W. Mints, Roger T. Vaughan, Everett V. Stonequist, Henry C. Simons, Margaret Grobhen, Howard B. Myers, Joseph E. Griffin, Gerard S. Brown, H. S. Irwin, George E. Hooker, John H. Sherman, John B. Woolsey, Harland H. Allen, Lester S. Kellogg.

Indiana

Indiana University: Thomas S. Luck, William C. Cleveland, Guy E. Morrison, James E. Moffat, Edwin J. Kunst.

Butler University: M. G. Bridenstein, Earl R. Beckner, Chester B. Camp, M. F. Gaudian.

Evansville College: Dean Long, Heber P. Walker, Paul G. Cressey.

Goshen College: Roland Yoder.

DePauw University: William R. Sherman, A. H. Woodworth.

Iowa

University of Iowa: E. B. Reuter, Richard W. Nelson, George W. Mitchell, J. L. Miller, J. E. Partington.

Drake University: David F. Owens, L. E. Hoffman, W. N. Rowlands, Herbert W. Bohlman, Herbert R. Mundhenke.

Iowa State College: Elizabeth Hoyt, John E. Brindley.

Penn College: President H. L. McCracken.

Grinnell College: Laetia M. Conard.

Kansas

University of Kansas: John Ise, Jens P. Jensen, Eugene Maynard, Domenico Gagliardo.

Kansas State Agricultural: Leo Spurrier, J. E. Karnmeyer, T. J. Anderson, Jr.

Kansas Wesleyan: David Dykstro.

Southwestern College: E. R. McCartney.

Bethel College: Robert G. O. Grovewald, J. E. Moyer, H. W. Guest, W. M. Blach.

Kentucky

University of Kentucky: Edward Weist, James W. Martin, J. Catron Jones, C. A. Pearce, J. Phillip Glenn, Harry Best, Esther Cole, Chester W. Shull, G. W. Patton, John Kimper, Dana G. Card, Saul K. Walz, H. Bruce Price, Walter W. Jennings.

Louisiana

Tulane University: Robert W. Elsasser, J. H. Stallings, National Fertilizer Co.

Maine

John W. Bowers.

Bowdoin College: Walter B. Catlin, Phillips Mason, Morgan B. Cushing, William W. Lockwood, Jr., Wilfred H. Crook.

Maryland

Theodore Marburg, Dexter M. Keezer.

Goucher College: Mollie Ray Carroll, Elinor Pancoast.

St. John's College: V. J. Wyckoff.

Johns Hopkins University: Broadus Mitchell.

Western Maryland College: W. B. Sanders, W. Scott Hall.

Massachusetts

Harvard University: G. B. Roorbach, John D. Black, Carl F. Taesch, N. S. B. Gras, Albert P. Usher, M. L. McElroy, Lawrence C. Lockley, T. H. Sanders, S. E. Harris, J. E. Dalton, Arthur W. Hanson, Donald H. Davenport, Scott Warren, Malcolm P. McNair, Murray R. Benedict, Albert O. Greef, P. T. Ellsworth, James A. Ross, Jr., George P. Baker, S. S. Stratton, Robert L. Masson, Edmund P. Learned, Joseph L. Snider, Karl W. Bigelow.

Amherst College: Willard L. Thorp, George R. Taylor, A. K. Eaton. Williams College: President H. A. Garfield, W. W. McLaren, Albert Sydney Bolles, Walter B. Smith, David Clark, Rosnell H. Whitman.

Wellesley College: Elizabeth Donnan, Lucy W. Killough, Emily Clark Brown, Mary B. Treudley.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: James C. MacKinnon, B. A. Thresher, Carroll W. Doten.

Tufts College: President John A. Couzens.

Smith College: Frank H. Hankins, Harold U. Faulkner.

Simmons College: Sara S. Stites.

Mount Holyoke College: Alzada Comstock.

Babson Institute: James M. Matthews.

Boston University: Charles T. Andrews.

Northeastern University: Milton J. Schlagenhauf, Julian E. Jackson, B. Gabine.

Clark University: Arthur F. Lucas, S. J. Brandenburg.

Wheaton College: Edith M. White.

Herman F. Arentz, John W. Boldyreff, Dickinson W. Leavens, Francis G. Goodale, L. H. Hauter, George M. Peterson, Samuel Sigilman, E. M. Winslow, A. S. Kingsmill, Prentice W. Townsley, Gilbert A. Tapley, L. H. L. Smith, John D. Willard, Lauchlin Currys, A. E. Monroe, C. L. McAleer, Arthur M. Moore, Harry Wood, Edward S. Mason, Lucile Eaves.

Michigan

Lawrence H. Seltzer, Arthur E. Erickson, Clifford E. King.

Battle Creek College: W. E. Payne.

Western State Teachers' College: Floyd W. Moore.

University of Michigan: Dean C. E. Griffin, G. S. Peterson, Roy G. Burroughs, Carroll H. May, Robert J. Henry, Ruth M. Engle, Nathaniel H. Engle, C. F. Remer.

Michigan State College: Herman Wyngarden.

Minnesota

Carleton College: J. S. Robinson, O. C. Helwig, Paul R. Fossum, Gordon H. Ward.

University of Minnesota: Roy G. Blakey, Alvin H. Hansen, B. D. Mudgett, O. B. Jesness, R. A. Stevenson, Carl C. Zimmerman, Roland S. Valle, Peter L. Stagswold, Glen R. Treanor, A. C. Haskin, Arthur W. Marget, O. W. Behrens, Richard L. Kozelka, J. Ross McFayden, John J. Reighard.

Mississippi

Agricultural and Mechanical College: Lewis E. Long.

Missouri

Chester W. Bigelow, S. F. Rigg.

Washington University: G. W. Stephens, J. Ray Cable, Orval Bennett, Ralph Carr Fletcher, Joseph M. Klamow, Joseph J. Senturia.

Westminster College: W. S. Krebs, Frank L. McCluer.

University of Missouri: Harry Gunnison Brown, James Harvey Rogers, Charles A. Elwood, F. L. Thomsen, B. H. Frame, C. H. Hammar, Preston Richard, D. C. Wood, H. C. Hensley, Morris D. Orten, Howard S. Jensen, Arthur S. Ennis, R. E. Curtis, George W. Baughman, O. R. Johnson.

Montana

University of Montana: Mattheas Kast.

Nebraska

Edward L. Taylor, W. G. L. Taylor, D. M. Halley.

Doane College: J. Harold Ennis, J. E. Taylor.

University of Nebraska: J. E. Lerossignol, G. O. Virtue, J. E. Kirshman, Vernon G. Morrison, Oscar R. Martin, J. C. Rankin.

Nevada

University of Nevada: Edward G. Sutherland, M. J. Webster, W. R. Blackhed, Ernest S. Brown.

New Hampshire

George W. Raynes.

University of New Hampshire: Claire W. Swonger, Carroll M. Degler, John D. Hauslein, H. J. Duncan, H. W. Smith.

Dartmouth College: Malcolm Kier, Ray V. Leffler, Robert E. Riegel, Russell D. Kilborne, W. A. Carter, Bruce W. Knight, Everett W. Goodhue, H. V. Olsen, Robert P. Lane, Louis W. Ingram, Archie M. Peisch, Stephen J. Navin, Herman Feldman, H. S. Raushenbush, Stacy May, H. F. R. Shaw, Earl R. Sikes, Lloyd P. Rice, Harry Purdy, J. L. McDonald, Nelson Lee Smith, Arthur Howe, G. Reginald Crosby, W. H. McPherson.

New Jersey

Walter H. Steinhauser, Edmund W. Foote, Augustus Smith, Franklin W. Ryan, Charles W. Lum, A. J. Duncan, Robert L. Smitley, Peter Fireman, Robert F. Foerster.

Princeton University: Frank A. Fetter, Frank Dixon, James J. Smith, Richard A. Lester, Vernon A. Mund, Denzel C. Cline, James M. Garrett, Stanley E. Howard, Donald L. Kemmerer, Frank W. Fetter, J. Douglas Brown, George F. Luthringer, Howard S. Piquet, George W. Modlin, J. W. Blum.

Rutgers University: E. E. Agger, Harry D. Gideons, Thomas W. Holland, E. L. Fisher.

New York

Columbia University: Wesley C. Mitchell, J. M. Clark, J. Russell Smith, James C. Bonbright, R. G. Tugwell, R. M. Maciver, Frederick M. Mills, Paul F. Brissenden, Robert E. Chaddock, Edward L. Thorndyke, Robert L. Hale, K. N. Llewellyn, A. H. Stockard, Edith Elmer Wood, William E. Dunkman, George Fillipetti, Edward J. Allen, Harold F. Clark, E. J. Hutchinson, B. H. Brechart, Addison T. Cutler, George Mitchell, Robert L. Carey, Elizabeth F. Baker, C. C. Williamson, Margaret Eagelson, Ralph H. Blanchard.

New York University: Wilford I. King, Myron W. Watkins, J. D. Magee, Walter E. Spahr, Maruc Nedler, Corwin D. Edwards, William E. Atkins, D. W. McConnell, A. A. Frederick, Richard A. Girard, Louis S. Reed, John J. Quigley, Carl Raushenbush, Irving Glass, Lois Maeslenold, Edith Ayres, Arthur Weeburg, Willard Friedman, Loyale A. Morrison, Randolph M. Binder, John H. Prime, John W. Wingate, Arthur Wubniez.

Cornell University: Sumner Slighter, Walter F. Willcox, Morris A. Copeland, Paul T. Homan, S. S. Garrett, M. Slade Kendrick, James E. Boyle, Paul M. O'Leary, Lewis A. Froman, Harold L. Read, Donald English, Julian L. Woodward, W. Ross Junkin, William R. Leonard, Leonard P. Adams, John H. Patterson.

Syracuse University: Harvey W. Peck, H. E. Bice.
Co-gate University: Freeman H. Allen, Albert L. Myers, E. Wilson Lyon, Sherman M. Smith, T. H. Robinson, N. J. Padelford, Everett Clair Bancroft, J. Millbourne Shortliffe.

Vassar College: Mabel Newcomer, Ruth G. Hutchinson, Kathleen C. Jackson, Herbert E. Mills.

University of Buffalo: Niles Carpenter, T. L. Norton, Newlin R. Smith, Raymond Chambers.

Union College: W. M. Bennett, Donald C. Riley, Daniel T. Selks. Wells College: Mabel A. Magee, Jean S. Davis.

Hobart College: W. A. Hosmer.

Hunter College: Eleanor H. Grady.

University of Rochester: Roth Clausung.

Brookwood Labor College: Daniel J. Saposs.

Taylor Society: H. S. Person, managing director.

The Business Week: Virgil Jordan, editor.

The Annalist: Bernard Ostrolenk, editor.

International Telephone Securities Co.: M. C. Porty.

Second International Securities Corporation: Leland R. Robinson.

Social Science Research Council: Meredith B. Givens.

American Electric Railways Association: Leslie Vickers.

Russell Sage Foundation: Mary Van Kleeck.

Tariff Board: N. I. Stone, formerly chief statistician.

Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America: Arthur E. Suf-
fern, Benson Y. Landis.

New York School of Social Work: John A. Fitch.

Clarkson College: Charles Leese.

Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc.: Mary B. Gilson, Murray

Latimer, W. Bert, S. Regalo, James W. Zonsen, Jeanne C. Barber.

Skidmore College: Coleman B. Cheney.

College of the City of New York: Ernest S. Bradford.

St. Lawrence University: Whitney Coombs.

Alfred University: Paul Rusby.

American Management Association: Mary Rogers Lyndsay, Leona

Powell.

American Association for Labor Legislation: George H. Trafton,

John B. Andrews.

Carl Snyder, Leo Wolman, George Soule, Stuart Chase, Herbert

Fels, Edward T. Devine, George P. Auld, Fabian Franklin, Lawson

Purdy, Gorton James, Paul W. Paustian, Warren W. Persons, Paul

Tuckerman, Charles B. Austin, Donald R. Belcher, H. T. Newcomb,

Lester Kirtzleb, A. W. Kattenhous, W. W. Cumberland, M. L.

Jacobson, R. D. Fleming, Dudley M. Irwin, George B. Hill, William

Church Osborne, Robert F. Binkled, E. B. Patten, Wendell M.

Strong, Ida Craven, Elizabeth Todd, A. D. Noyes, Robert E. Cor-

radini, Samuel M. Dix, W. C. Wishart, Edward E. Hardy, Ernest G.

Draper, M. Leo Gitelson, Harold Fields, Henry Israel, Asher Achen-

stein, F. L. Patton, Stanley B. Hunt, R. L. Wiseman, Shelby M.

Harrison, Rufus S. Tucker, John J. Wille, R. D. Patton, William E.

Johnson, Albert W. Russell, Robert T. Hill, D. J. Cowden, W. D.

Gann, Melbourne S. Moyer, Herbert Fordham, Owen Ely, Roger H.

Williams, Robert M. Woodbury, May Lerner, Elsie Gluck, Paul

Bonwit, Robert D. Kohn, V. Kelley, J. C. Meeder, Cyrus L. Sulz-

berger, Charles S. Bernheimer, Ephraim A. Karselen, Henry C.

Hasbrouck, Robert Whitten, P. M. Tuttle, F. Lewis Corser, Jeanett

Kimball, Francis H. McLean, John M. Glenn, C. P. Fuller, Emily

Barrofs Weber, Richard Kramer, Montefiore G. Kahn, Mary A.

Prentiss, L. R. Gottlieb, Charles R. Fay, Martin Clark, John P.

Munn, Otto S. Whitelock, Victor Morawetz, Clinton Collier, Helen

Sumner Woodbury, William Seagle, Helen Sullivan, Bettina

Sinclair.

North Carolina

Selma Rogas, C. K. Brown, A. Currie, Maxwell G. Pangle, Carl J.

Whelan.

North Carolina State College: Joseph G. Knapp.

University of North Carolina: Dean D. D. Carroll, J. Gilbert

Evans, W. F. Fenger, C. T. Murchison, G. T. Schwenning, E. D.

Strong.

North Carolina College for Women: Albert S. Keister.

Duke University: R. A. Harvill, J. P. Breedlove, J. H. Shields, Wil-

liam J. H. Colton, Christopher Roberts, E. R. Gray, B. U. Ratchford,

Robert S. Smith.

Elon College: Ralph B. Tower.

North Dakota

Dana G. Tinnies, James Forgerson.
University of North Dakota: Dean E. T. Towne, J. Donald Pymm,
A. G. Rowlands, Daniel J. Schwiager, J. Perlman, Spencer A. Larsen,
J. J. Rellahan, Roy E. Brown, Carmen G. Blough, E. C. Koch, V. A.
Newcomb, Daniel James.

Ohio

Ohio State University: Matthew B. Hammond, Milo Kimball,
J. J. Spengler, Clifford L. James, E. L. Bowers, Henry J. Buttermann,
W. M. Duffas, Louise Stitt, Wilford J. Eiteman, Paul N. Lehocyky,
N. Gilbert Riddle.

Antioch College: William M. Leiserson, Rudolf Broda, Algo D.
Henderson.

Lake Erie College: Olive D. Reddick.

Wooster College: Alvin S. Testlebe, E. E. Cummins.

University of Cincinnati: Harry Henig.

Miami University: Warren S. Thompson, P. K. Whelpton, Edwin

S. Todd, H. H. Beneke, Henry P. Shearman, C. H. Sandage, Howard

White, Howard R. Whinson, John F. Schreiner, Wilfrid G. Richards,

Carroll B. Malone, James H. St. John, F. B. Joyner, W. J. M. Neff,

J. R. Dennison, J. M. Gersting, Read Bain.

Heidelberg College: Ossian Gruber.

Hiram College: J. E. Smith.

Denison University: Hiram L. Jome, Harold H. Titus, Leo A.

Thaake, Charles West, Frederick E. Detweiler.

Western Reserve University: Claude Stimson, O. J. Marsh, Louis

O. Foster, C. C. Arbuthnot.

Oberlin University: C. C. Bayard, Paul S. Peirce.

Case School of Applied Science: Frank T. Carleton.

Kenyon College: George M. James.

Municipal University of Akron: W. W. Leigh.

University of the City of Toledo: Clair K. Searles, Dr. I. M.

Rubino, Edward D. Jones, John A. Zangerle, I. W. Appleby, Amy

G. Maher, Homer H. Johnson, E. L. Oliver, Thomas M. Wolfe,

Grover P. Osborne, Eugene H. Foster.

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.: H. L. Flanick, Royal E. Davis.

Oklahoma

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College: Orman W. Her-
mann, P. H. Stephens, J. T. Sanders.

University of Tulsa: A. M. Paxson, W. M. Maurer.

University of Oklahoma: Dean Paul L. Vogt, Leonard Logan, Jr.,

John P. Ewing, Ivar Axelsson, N. Grady Sloan.

Northeastern State Teachers' College: Dean Sobin C. Percefull.

Oregon

Oregon State College: E. B. Mittelman, F. L. Robinson, Alfred C.
Schmidt, Curtis Kelley, Bertha Whillock, Lella Hay, E. E. Farns-
worth, J. H. Irvine, H. K. Roberts.

Reed College: Clement Akerman, Blair Stewart.

Pacific University: Harold N. Burt, Harold Harward.

University of Oregon: Vernon G. Sorrell.

Pennsylvania

University of Pennsylvania: Emory R. Johnson (dean), Raymond
T. Bye, Paul F. Gemmill, William C. Schluter, Stuart A. Rice,
W. E. Fisher, William N. Loucks, Karl Scholz, Clyde M. Kahler,
Raymond T. Bowman, Weldon Hoot, William J. Carson.

Temple University: Russell H. Mack, William J. Douglas, S. S.
Hoffer.

Wilson College: Henrietta C. Jennings.

Lehigh University: E. A. Bradford, Eimer C. Bratt.

University of Pittsburgh: Francis T. Tyson, Marion K. McKay,

Colston E. Warne, Donald D. Kennedy, Vincent W. Lanfear, Hugh

M. Fletcher, P. N. Dean.

Washington and Jefferson: Carl W. Kaiser.

Bryn Mawr College: Harnell Hartz.

Franklin and Marshall: Horace R. Barnes, Edward L. Lancaster,

Wesley Gadd, Noel P. Laird, Harold Fisher.

Haverford College: Don C. Barrett, John G. Herndon, Jr.

Pennsylvania State College: Earl V. Dye, W. E. Butt, H. W.

Stover.

Drexel Institute: Edwin J. Kaschenbach, A. E. Blackstone, C. L.

Nickels, Earl Spargue, W. N. McMullan.

Swarthmore College: Robert C. Brooks, Herbert F. Fraser, Troyer

S. Anderson, J. Roland Pennock.

J. Henry Scattergood, Hugo Bilgram, Carl W. Fenninger, Louis

N. Robinson, M. S. D'Essipri, Charles L. Serrill, John C. Lowry,

Herbert S. Welsh, Raymond Symestvadt, Alexander Fleischer.

Rhode Island

Brown University: C. C. Bosland, Willard C. Beatty.

Rhode Island State College: Andrew J. Newman.

South Carolina

Furman University: A. G. Griffin.

South Dakota

A. L. Osborne.

Tennessee

E. P. Aldredge.

University of Chattanooga: C. W. Phelps.

Southwestern University: M. H. Townsend, Horace B. Davis.

University of the South: Eugene M. Kayden, William S. Knicken-

backer, W. H. MacKellar, J. J. Davis, I. Q. Ware, George W. Nichol-

son, J. P. Jersey, C. B. Wilmer.

Texas

University of Texas: R. H. Montgomery, A. S. Lang.
A. and M. College: F. B. Clark, G. C. Vaughn, Thomas A. Hamilton.
Southern Methodist University: William F. Hanbart, Donald Scott, Frank K. Rader, Laurence H. Fleck.
Texas Technological College: John C. Granbery, Ormond C. Corry, Harold R. Nissley, B. F. Coldray, Jr.

Utah

Latter Day Saints' College: Feramorz Y. Fox.

Vermont

University of Vermont: George C. Groat, Claude L. Stineford,
L. Douglas Meredith.

Virginia

William H. Stauffer.
College of William and Mary: Shirley D. Southworth, A. G. Taylor.
Randolph-Macon: Langdon White.
Washington and Lee: Robert H. Tucker, E. E. Ferebee, M. C. Robaugh, M. Ogden Phillips, R. G. Lausgobel, Dean G. D. Hancock.
University of Virginia: Wilson Gee, Charles N. Hulvey, G. R. Snively, Abraham Berglund, A. J. Barlow, E. A. Hinlaid, G. S. Starnes, William H. Wendel.

Washington

Arthur B. Young.
University of Washington: Theresa S. McMahon.
State College of Washington: Lawrence Clark.

West Virginia

University of West Virginia: E. H. Vickers, A. J. Dadisman.
Marshall College: C. E. Carpenter.

Wisconsin

Charles E. Brooks, Eldred M. Keayes, Alice E. Belcher, Ethel Wynn, R. Beckwith, J. Roy Blough, A. R. Schnaitter, Mary S. Peterson, William D. Thompson.
Lawrence College: R. H. Lounsbury, W. A. McConacha, M. M. Bober, M. M. Evans.
Beloit College: Lewis Severson, Lloyd U. Ballard, Dwight L. Palmer.
Marquette University: Lyle W. Cooper, William H. Ten Haken, Leo A. Schmidt, Oscar F. Brown, N. J. Hoffman, George W. Knick.
University of Wisconsin: Frederick A. Ogg, Edward A. Ross, William H. Kiekhofer, Selig Perlman, Alma Bridgman, Elizabeth Brandeis, Arthur Hallahan, Philip G. Fox, H. Rowland English, J. C. Gibson, Stanley Rector, George S. Wehrwein, William A. Scott, Paul A. Rauschenbush, M. G. Glaeser, I. A. Hensey, Arnold Zempel, J. L. Miller, Russell H. Baugh, J. Marvin Peterson, Harold M. Groves, Alfred W. Briggs, Margaret Pryor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include two editorials from Philadelphia newspapers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein brief tables and a list of manufacturers in the State of Michigan, together with a quotation from Mr. GIFFORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a newspaper clipping which is a tribute to the late Robert Fechner, Director of the C. C. C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a statement of the archbishops and bishops of the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE CYRENUS COLE

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of the late Honorable Cyrenus Cole, one of Iowa's distinguished citizens,

came as a distinct shock to me and, I know also, to those Members of the body who were privileged to know him. For 12 years, 1921 to 1933, Congressman Cole ably represented the interests of his constituency in the former Fifth Congressional District of Iowa and rendered marked service to his State in the National House of Representatives.

Retiring voluntarily from public office at the end of his sixth term in Congress, he devoted the remaining years of a busy and useful life to the compilation of a history of Iowa which is acknowledged to be a worthy contribution to the literature of the State and to serve as a fitting monument for a splendid citizen and public servant.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business on the calendar for Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. DREWRY (at the request of Mr. BLAND), on account of sickness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows: S. 2617. An act to authorize the leasing of the undeveloped coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 20, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting on Tuesday, February 20, 1940, at 10 a. m., before the petroleum subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Industry will be heard.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

On Tuesday, February 20, 1940, there will be a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs at 10:30 a. m. to consider H. R. 8446, to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended, and H. R. 7809, authorizing the reconstruction or replacement of certain bridges necessitated by the Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriation for that purpose.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs on Wednesday next, February 21, 1940, at 10:30 a. m. for the consideration of H. R. 2775, Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians jurisdictional bill.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

Tuesday, February 20, 1940:

H. R. 4079, to amend sections 4353 and 4355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

H. R. 6751, to repeal certain laws with respect to manifests and vessel permits.

H. R. 5788, to amend the present law relating to the delivery of ships' manifests to collectors of customs by excluding Sundays and holidays from the time within which such delivery may be made by the master.

H. R. 5789, to amend the present law relating to the delivery of ships' manifests to collectors of customs by excluding Sun-

days and holidays from the time within which such delivery may be made by the master.

Friday, February 23, 1940:

H. R. 7639, to provide for the examination of civilian nautical schools and for the inspection of vessels used in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, March 19, 1940:

H. R. 6136, to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1353; 34 U. S. C. 1122), so as to authorize an appropriation of \$50,000 annually to aid in the maintenance and support of marine schools.

H. R. 7094, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to construct or acquire vessels to be furnished the States of New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and California for the benefit of their respective nautical schools, and for other purposes.

H. R. 7870, to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, to include Astoria, Oreg.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House in room 1310, New House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m., February 20, 1940, for the consideration of all bills pending before this committee relative to taxation of Tennessee Valley Authority properties.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

On Wednesday, February 21, 1940, at 10 a. m., there will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to consider H. R. 8350, permitting official mail of the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau to be transmitted in penalty envelopes; also H. R. 8398, a bill amending acts extending the franking privilege to widows of ex-Presidents of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

Beginning Tuesday, February 27, 1940, the Committee on the Census will hold hearings on the reapportionment of Representatives in Congress.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents, House of Representatives, will hold hearings Thursday, March 14, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 8445, to protect the United States in patent-infringement suits. H. R. 8445 is a substitute for H. R. 6877.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1401. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 13, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on beach-erosion study, Orange County, Calif., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and by act of Congress approved June 26, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 637); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with 19 illustrations.

1402. A letter from the acting president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, designed to reorganize, in the interest of efficiency, the internal affairs of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 2843. An act granting easements on Indian lands of the Wind River or Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo., for dam site and reservoir purposes in connection with the Riverton reclamation project; without amendment (Rept. No. 1617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEBOUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 8157. A bill to establish a national land policy, and to provide homesteads for actual farm families; with amendment (Rept. No. 1618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2008. A bill to increase the lump-sum payment made under the Workmen's Compensation Act in cases of permanent total disability suffered prior to February 12, 1927; without amendment (Rept. No. 1619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4828. A bill to amend the law limiting the operation of statutes of limitations in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5292. A bill to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, and the United States Court for China; without amendment (Rept. No. 1621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7660. A bill to amend section 35B of the United States Criminal Code to prohibit purchase or receipt in pledge of clothing and other supplies issued to veterans maintained in Veterans' Administration facilities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8119. A bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to confer concurrent jurisdiction on courts of the United States over crimes committed on certain Federal reservations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 448. Joint resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure an oil portrait of Charles Moore; without amendment (Rept. No. 1625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 538. An act for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding town site, Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 1624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8532. A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDAGER:

H. R. 8533. A bill to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station at Quonset Point, R. I.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 8534. A bill to amend Public Law No. 844; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 8535. A bill to cancel indebtedness and release liens arising under certain feed and seed and drought loans to

farmers made prior to January 1, 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 8536. A bill to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 8537. A bill to provide for the enlargement of the Coast Guard depot at Seattle, Wash., and for the establishment of a Coast Guard servicing base at or near Chattanooga, Tenn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 8538. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation as a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt of the Maltese Cross Ranch, Billings County, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 8539. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935, and the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the definition of "employee"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 8540. A bill to authorize an increase in the White House police force; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 8541 (by request). A bill to authorize the granting of a right-of-way for roadway purposes on the Fort Thomas Military Reservation, Ky., in exchange for the release of property rights in and to a certain road on said reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 8542 (by request). A bill to authorize the appointment of female dietitians and female physical-therapy aides in the Medical Department of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 8543. A bill authorizing employees in the United States Public Health Service and other Government agencies to accept or reject quarters and subsistence furnished by the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 8544. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of part of Old Tampa Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 8545. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of a channel 22 feet deep from the bridge at Bradenton to the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 8546. A bill to assist public agencies in the conservation of the water, fuel, and other power resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STARNES of Alabama:

H. R. 8547. A bill to authorize loans to public bodies and nonprofit organizations for hospital, water, sewer, stream-pollution control, and related projects and facilities, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 8548. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Salt Creek River of the Arkansas River and its tributaries in the State of Oklahoma, Osage County, for flood control for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 8549. A bill for the relief of the Cherokee Indian Nation or Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 8550. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into cooperative agreements or leases with farmers and the owners of forest lands in order to provide for their

management in accordance with proper forestry practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 461. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H. R. 8551. A bill for the relief of Xenophon George Panos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 8552. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Cook; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWIN A. HALL:

H. R. 8553. A bill granting a pension to Bessie G. Radliff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 8554. A bill for the relief of George H. Kerley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 8555. A bill for the relief of Jessie L. Kerley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 8556. A bill for the relief of Wanita Burris Bailey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8557. A bill for the relief of Edward James McCarten; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 8558. A bill for the relief of Elmer Summers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 8559. A bill for the relief of John De Ligter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 8560. A bill for the relief of Otis Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHUETZ:

H. R. 8561. A bill for the relief of Salman Bermann; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6583. By Mr. BEAM: Petition of the Polish American Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6584. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of members of the Rotary Club of Delavan, Wis., urging Congress to give its support to a program providing for adequate funds for proper forest-fire protection, either through the release of funds authorized under the Clarke-McNary Act or by new legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6585. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Lyons, Wis., supporting the Patman chain-store tax bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6586. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition signed by citizens of Center, N. Dak., to enact the Ludlow war referendum resolution (H. Res. 408); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6587. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of the Cincinnati Bakers' Supply Co. and sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the levying of excise or any other form of processing taxes on bread and other every-day indispensable necessities of life; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6588. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of the California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9, relative to discrimination in steamship service and freight rates between New York and California ports to the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6589. By Mr. HARTER of New York: Petition of the New York State Assembly, requesting enactment of legislation to

end discrimination against older persons in the Federal civil service and that the work of public and private agencies in behalf of the middle-aged worker be enhanced by the good example set by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6590. By Mr. HEALEY: Petition of the City Council of Cambridge, Mass., petitioning the Congress of the United States to appropriate immediately necessary funds and enact legislation to repeal the mandatory provisions relating to the 30-day furlough after 18 months' employment on Work Projects Administration or amend same so as to restore to employment immediately on expiration of the 30-day furlough all persons who have been recertified and are eligible for reemployment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6591. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of 87 members of Czech Lodge, 4769, International Workers, New York City, vigorously protesting against any loans being made by the United States to White Guard Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6592. Also, petition of Local 162, United Federal Workers of America, Northport, Long Island, N. Y., urging support of the Sabbath bill (H. R. 7708); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6593. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of Local 162, United Federal Workers of America, Northport, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Sabbath bill (H. R. 7708); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6594. Also, petition of the Jamaica Estates Association, Inc., Jamaica Estates Long Island, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Barry bill for a uniform 2-cent postage for Queens County, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6595. Also, petition of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, Washington, D. C., concerning the reciprocal-trade agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6596. Also, petition of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Edward J. O'Neal, president, favoring the continuance of reciprocal-trade agreements contained in House Joint Resolution 407; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6597. Also, petition of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, Inc., New York City, concerning the modification of the Fair Standards Act to exempt employees of wholesale distributors from the hours limitations (but not the wage limitations) now prescribed by law; to the Committee on Labor.

6598. Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, Washington, D. C., concerning the submission of the equal-rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6599. Also, petition of the Cigar Manufacturers' Association of America, Inc., New York City, favoring reciprocal trade agreements legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6600. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Ottumwa, Centerville, Lorimor, Bloomfield, New Sharon, Oskaloosa, Sigourney, and Harper, Iowa, concerning the chain-store tax bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6601. By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI: Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held in Chicago, Ill., recently under the jurisdiction of the Polish-American Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6602. By Mr. RANKIN: Petition of the Legislature of Mississippi; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6603. By Mr. TALLE: Three petitions of 56 citizens of Mitchell County, Iowa, urging the Congress to enact House bill 1 into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6604. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolution of the delegates of the ninth circuit of the Polish-American Council, extending their full and grateful support to the bills and resolutions now pending in Congress for the appropriation of money for the relief of destitute Polish populations in German-occupied Poland and in neighboring countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6605. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of the Legislature of the State of Texas, urging the Congress to oppose the adop-

tion of House bill 7372, the Cole bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6606. By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Clifford Breton, of Depew, and Paul DeMuth, of Corfu, N. Y., and others; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God be merciful unto us, and bless us, and cause His face to shine upon us. Heavenly Father, with our souls enrobed with this prayer, and with a chastening sense of our failures and needs, we pray for Thy guiding grace and wisdom. May Thy presence with us be like the sun that radiates light, like the stars that shed calmness, like the morning that sings freshness, and like the evening that whispers quietness. This day let us be at rest in the Father's love and in the gracious protection of His Son, Jesus Christ, the friend of man and the Saviour of the world. Do Thou ever enfold us in the blessed security of the everlasting arms. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 112. An act to facilitate control of soil erosion and flood damage on lands within the Ozark and Ouachita National Forests in Arkansas;

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of Maj. Herbert A. Jacob;

H. R. 2860. An act for the relief of Ben Willie Jones, as legal representative of Thelma Jones, a deceased minor;

H. R. 3391. An act providing payment to employees, Bureau of Reclamation, for mileage traveled in privately owned automobiles;

H. R. 3794. An act to establish the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., to transfer thereto the lands now included in the General Grant National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of M. L. Parish;

H. R. 6084. An act for the relief of Katheryn S. Anderson; and

H. R. 7050. An act for the relief of certain former disbursing officers for the Civil Works Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3481. An act for the relief of C. Z. Bush and W. D. Kennedy; and

H. R. 4126. An act for the relief of Warren Zimmerman.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 815. An act for the relief of Christine Lund;

S. 1373. An act for the relief of H. D. Bateman, Henry G. Conner, Jr., executor of the last will and testament of P. L. Woodard, and J. M. Creech;

S. 1450. An act to provide funds for cooperation with school district No. 13, Froid, Mont., for extension of public-school buildings to be available to Indian children;

S. 1531. An act for the relief of Edmund S. Dennis;

S. 1671. An act to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school buildings in Uintah County, Utah;

S. 2103. An act to exempt certain Indians and Indian tribes from the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended;